

"SEC. 15. That on and after the approval of this act no lands in Alaska containing deposits of coal withdrawn from entry or sale shall be disposed of or acquired in any manner except as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not affect any proceeding now pending in the Department of the Interior, and any such proceeding may be carried to a final determination in said department notwithstanding the passage hereof: *Provided further*, That no lease shall be made, under the provisions hereof, of any land, a claim for which is pending in the Department of the Interior at the date of the passage of this act, until and unless such claim is finally disposed of by the department adversely to the claimant.

"SEC. 16. That all statements, representations, or reports required, unless otherwise specified, by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be upon oath and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require, and any person making false oath, representation, or report shall be subject to punishment as for perjury.

"SEC. 17. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 18. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

H. L. MYERS,
WM. H. THOMPSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SCOTT FERRIS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the report go over until to-morrow, and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be printed and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Monday, October 12, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, October 13, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 8), 1914.

MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Antonio R. Barceló, of Porto Rico, vice Martin Travieso. Nominated for appointment as member of the Executive Council of Porto Rico, provided for in section 18 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes."

CONSUL.

James C. Monaghan, of Bayonne, N. J., to be consul of the United States of America at Kingston, Jamaica, vice Thomas Willing Peters, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

First Lieut. Glen E. Edgerton, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 2, 1914, vice Capt. Charles K. Rockwell, resigned October 1, 1914.

Second Lieut. Leo J. Dillow, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from October 2, 1914, vice First Lieut. Glen E. Edgerton, promoted.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Jacob A. Mack, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from October 2, 1914, vice Capt. Harrison S. Kerrick, detached from his proper command.

Second Lieut. John P. McCaskey, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from October 2, 1914, vice First Lieut. Jacob A. Mack, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Harrison, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from October 5, 1914, vice First Lieut. Vir-

ginus E. Clark, detailed in the aviation section of the Signal Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Jonas H. Holden to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Lieut. Levin J. Wallace to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Passed Asst. Surg. Wesley H. Rennie to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 8), 1914.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas Jones, of Vale, Oreg., to be register of the land office at Vale, Oreg., vice Bruce R. Kester, term expired.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Rufus Z. Johnston to be a commander.

The following-named assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps to be assistant surgeons:

Charles E. Treibly.

William W. Hargrave.

Charles S. Stephenson.

Roscoe M. Waterhouse.

Summerfield M. Taylor to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Paymaster Walter B. Izard to be a pay inspector.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Michael O. Haggerty, North Adams.

Frank I. Pierson, Leominster.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, October 12, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this beautiful day, token of Thy presence and continued care. For all the longings, hopes, and aspirations which fill our minds and hearts. Help us with renewed faith and confidence to work ever toward the higher ideals as we know them in Christ Jesus, that we may awake at last in the consciousness of our likeness to Thee and in fullness of joy hear the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." And we will ascribe all praises to Thee, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 10, 1914, was read.

CORRECTION OF A VOTE.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the RECORD and the Journal. On page 6134 of the RECORD of April 1, 1914, I am recorded as not voting. I was present at that time and voted "yea."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made in the Journal and in the RECORD in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The motion was agreed to.

COTTON.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to print in the RECORD a copy of my letter in reply to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. A few days ago the Secretary of the Treasury caused to have printed in the RECORD, at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. HOLLIS, a letter to me upon the cotton and currency question, and I should like to have my reply appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing in the RECORD his reply to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say this: I have uniformly objected to this debate going on upon the cotton question. I had a request from the gen-

tleman sitting on the other side of the aisle on Saturday to print the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I told him that I should object to that and to all such propositions, because I believed the debate should be had here on the floor of the House, open to Members of the House, and for that reason I must object to this request.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object to this. I am sure he wants to uphold the dignity of the House. Inasmuch as the Senate has authorized the printing of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, it seems to me that a humble Member of the House ought to be permitted to print his reply, so that the membership may see his views. I am doing everything that I can to secure a vote and debate upon this question, and hope and believe that by to-morrow this matter can be presented to the House of Representatives for some sort of action. I am leaving nothing undone to bring it before the House, and if the gentleman will allow this reply to be inserted, I assure him that I will not abate my zeal in endeavoring to secure a vote. I only want my rights as a Member of the House protected. I do not think I ought to be deprived of that privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] object.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, I do not object. I only reserved the right to object for the purpose of stating that I hope that no objection will be made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

ALASKA COAL LANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 8 (calendar day October 10), 1914.

Ordered, That the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the conference committee.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I wish to inquire whether or not the Chair holds that the Philippine bill takes precedence over District matters to-day?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Very well.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special rule the House will resolve itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, and in the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, with Mr. ADAIR in the chair.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER. It is rather embarrassing for me to make this inquiry, Mr. Chairman. At the conclusion of the sitting of the committee on Saturday I had offered a motion to strike out a portion of the paragraph now being considered. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made a point of order against my amendment, claiming it was included in a previous motion to strike out made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Without any adequate discussion or consideration of the precedents, the Chair sustained the point of order. My parliamentary inquiry is now whether or not the Chair is willing to have that matter discussed in order that the precedents may be presented, with a view to deciding whether or not it would be advisable to overrule the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not in the Chamber at that time—

Mr. MILLER. My embarrassment arises from that fact, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But as the Chair is informed, the point of order was sustained by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER. Without any consideration of the precedents, Mr. Chairman; we did not have time then to present them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the point of order was sustained.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman how many more amendments he has to this section?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that this is the only amendment which I had to the section, but since Saturday I have drafted a lot of them. I do not know that I shall offer any of them, but I have them.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to see if we can reach an agreement with the gentleman in some way. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I thought the point of order was well taken.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be very pleased to discuss that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not care to argue it if we can save time otherwise. If we can save time and get away from this proposition, I would be willing to let the gentleman ask unanimous consent, as far as I am concerned, if the chairman of the committee will agree. If this is the only amendment the gentleman has to offer, that he should discuss it for five minutes and then we should vote on it.

Mr. MILLER. I would not be willing to make that kind of an agreement, although I would say to the gentleman I have no disposition to delay the bill at all, but I am firmly convinced the ruling of the Chair on Saturday was erroneous, and I think I can show it in two minutes by the precedents of the House and by the unquestionable parliamentary holdings. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to ask unanimous consent with that feature attached to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that he understands the point of order was made and the point of order was sustained by the then Chairman of the committee, and so far as the present occupant of the chair is concerned that ends the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time does the gentleman desire to discuss this amendment? I understand there will be no other amendment to this section offered on this side. Perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee will agree to further extension of time in order to expedite the consideration of the bill. I understand this is the only amendment the gentleman proposes to offer.

Mr. MILLER. No; I would not want that to be understood.

Mr. BRYAN. No; I would not care to agree to that.

Mr. MILLER. I am not quite certain of my parliamentary situation, but I should imagine, inasmuch as that is the last act of the committee, if the Chair were so disposed, the Chair could open the discussion for further consideration of the point of order and change the Chair's position if he thought proper so to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not feel warranted in setting aside the action of the former Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. I assumed that is true, and that is the unfortunate situation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed for a moment—we are exceedingly anxious now to make progress upon this bill. I think everybody in the House understands why. There has been very liberal debate, under the five-minute rule; in fact there has been no attempt at any time, as I recall, to close debate, and it has not been closed at any time except by unanimous consent. I reiterate that I believed the point of order was well taken, and I felt like it was my duty to make the point of order, because I thought we ought to protect the bill, not because I had any objection to the proposition offered by the gentleman from Minnesota being voted upon by the House. Now, I should be willing myself to ask unanimous consent that the point of order be vacated and that it may be offered and voted upon if we can reach some reasonable agreement. I understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] wishes to offer an amendment other than the amendment which has been offered. Does the gentleman object to stating what the character of his amendment is—

Mr. BRYAN. No.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So that we can proceed?

Mr. BRYAN. It is a phase of this suffrage proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I think the gentleman, if he has examined the precedents himself, will agree that that ruling was undoubtedly right.

Mr. BRYAN. I have nothing against that, and I am not going to raise any question on any ruling heretofore made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I should be very glad if we can reach an agreement in order to save time.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman, after considering the matter since Saturday, I concluded that I have enough material to occupy about 10 minutes in presenting it. Now, I have one other amendment, which I do not care to discuss, but I am willing to offer it with possibly a moment of consideration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state what that amendment is?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; it was suggested to me by persons very much interested in the islands, and it provides that American citizens in the islands shall have the right to vote and hold office, but I would not care to enter upon a discussion of that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That amendment would undoubtedly be in order.

Mr. MILLER. I have another amendment that, I think, is in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman wishes to offer three amendments?

Mr. MILLER. No; two.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is, the one offered the other day, excluded by the point of order, and this one?

Mr. MILLER. I am not particular about the one offered the other day. I have one that I think the committee will vote down, because it has been disposed to take that action.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us see if we can not reach an agreement. How much time will the gentleman from Washington desire in reference to this matter?

Mr. BRYAN. I shall only want five minutes. Five minutes is all I care for on my amendment, and I am willing to agree that I have that time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 21 minutes, 11 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 21 minutes, 11 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

After the word "write," in line 4, page 12, insert "any section of this act in."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 4, after the word "write," insert the words "any section of this act in," so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"(c) Those who are able to read and write any section of this act in either Spanish, English, or a native language."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should really much prefer that the amendment should have been that which I offered the other day, namely, to strike out the words "or native language." I think the amendment was entirely in order, as sustained by the precedents of the House, but inasmuch as it was decided it was not in order, that ends it so far as that amendment is concerned. This amendment requires any person to possess the ability to read or write any section of this act either in English, Spanish, or native language. I am firmly of the opinion that the language employed in this act will open a Pandora's box in the Philippine Islands.

Now, I sincerely trust that no one will feel that I am in a critical attitude particularly, and certainly will not imagine that I am in any degree hostile to any of the ambitious or aspirations or desires of the Filipino people. I hope I shall never say anything or do anything that will be opposed to any of their legitimate aspirations. I am deeply in sympathy with most of them. But there are some facts associated with that which you are about to write into this act which you ought to know. I do not ask, Mr. Chairman, that you take my word for it. I am going to read to you, first and foremost, from a very distinguished Democrat, a gentleman who has had a great many years of experience in the islands, who has had many years' experience as a judge, and whose whole life and fortune

are wrapped up in the future welfare of the islands. This is what he says:

The words "or a native language" should be stricken from paragraph (c) of this section. The insertion of these words was obviously for the purpose of enlarging the electorate, and it would give in the election statistics a false appearance of literacy of the population. If this provision remains in the law it will result in qualifying as electors thousands of ignorant natives who will be managed, controlled, and voted in blocks by the petty politicians in the rural districts, as are now those electors qualifying under provisions of existing law exactly the same as those contained in paragraph (a) of section 15. Ninety per cent of the turmoil resulting from contested elections in this country, of which there are an astounding number, is due to this provision of the election law now in force. The great majority of men who qualify on account of having held petty municipal offices under the Spanish Government are ignorant and illiterate peasants who are herded to the polls like cattle at the will of the village bosses. As for being able to read and write a native language, thousands of natives have received sufficient instructions in the village schools to enable them to read after a fashion such simple literature as is printed in the various native dialects, and laboriously to write a little of their native language. This knowledge, to say the most for it, is about equivalent to that of a 6-year-old child in the United States of English, and carries with it nothing of real qualification for the suffrage. Under this extension of the franchise, local native election boards would, when it suited their purposes, give to it a liberal interpretation, permitting to qualify as electors hordes of ignorant natives with no conception of the rights and duties of citizenship, with absolutely no will of their own in public matters, and subject to the control of the worst class of politicians. It would make worse a situation already bad enough. As a matter of fact, there is not in this country to-day any such thing as real representative government, and most elections are the merest farces. President Wilson speaks of his "passion for the submerged 85 per cent" of the Mexican people. About 95 per cent is the figure in the Philippine Islands. These masses have not the faintest conception of republican government, no will or opinion as to public questions, and no means of expressing them if they had; and not until, after many years, the education of the children of the people now going forward as rapidly as possible has produced its effect will such a thing as republican government be possible in this country. I suppose that the pretense of popular government and playing at elections initiated under and continued by the past administration must be kept up, but let us be as sensible as possible about it and not make the farce still more ridiculous.

My only reason for inserting that is that it is from the viewpoint of a Democrat; a man who knows the facts. It is not that there shall be urged hostility to the Filipino people. It is to call attention to a great number of voters who will be enfranchised by this, but who are not now ready to assume the responsibilities of that franchise. The Filipino people are making remarkable progress, but give them a chance. Do not deluge them with political troubles while they are making this advance.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman give us the name of the writer of that letter?

Mr. MILLER. I have not his permission to give it publicly, or I would be glad to do so. I would not care to place it in the RECORD without his sanction, and I have not his sanction.

Now, this is the opinion of a Republican:

The extension of the franchise to those who can read and write a native language would be disastrous. Probably 75 per cent of the present electorate is incapable of independent or intelligent voting, and the present scandalous practices in elections are due to the great proportion of ignorant and helpless voters. Obviously the class to be added would be of scant education and would increase the number of voters and lower the average capacity. With complaisant election officials almost every adult male could qualify, cacique rule would be more firmly established, and the party now in control of the machine would be fortified. It is very well to increase the number of voters if this can be done without lowering the standard; the schools are gradually adding educated voters, and it might be well to consider extending the franchise to women who can qualify by education or wealth. The character of the women of the Philippines and the position they now hold in society and in the family and even in business would make their enfranchisement reasonable and proper.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio some time ago made the statement, and he made it correctly, as I recall, so far as it went—I am referring to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]—as to the literacy in the islands found by the census of 1903, but the statement standing by itself does not tell the whole story. I find in that report the following language:

Those who were able to read but not write numbered 1,208,845, which was 24.3 per cent, or a little less than one-quarter of all the inhabitants 10 years of age and over. Those able to both read and write numbered 1,002,588, and constituted 20.2 per cent, or about one-fifth of those who were at least 10 years of age. In this part of the population was included a small element who had received superior education. They numbered only 76,627, or 1.6 per cent of the population over 10 years of age.

I find in the report of the executive secretary, recently made, a comment pertinent and important, and I desire to read it at this point. In speaking of the elections and the difficulty they are having by reason of ignorant voters, he says:

Although the educational qualification for voting is not high—consisting only of ability to speak and write either English or Spanish—the proportion of electors shown to possess this degree of education, including the city of Manila, where 86 per cent were literate, was nearly, but not quite, one-third of those registered. In the Provinces alone but 30 per cent were educated. This lack of education required a large number of ballots to be prepared by the inspectors, a proceeding which opens the door to fraud and which is known to be one of the

chief reasons for the large number of protested elections, which was 240. The proportion of literate electors to the population in the territory affected was 1.47 per cent.

Now, it comes, Mr. Chairman, only from my sincere desire that we give to the people of the Philippine Islands an election law that will help them and not hurt them that I offer this amendment. They are progressing rapidly. The time is going to come when the percentage of literacy will be high and widespread. They are moving toward it rapidly and showing an eagerness for education most commendable; showing a development that should give them great national pride. But do not for any reason on earth put into the hands of this class of people a ballot which they do not know how to use.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes left.

Mr. MILLER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, when I shall have occupied two minutes I hope the Chair will call my attention to the fact.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat the arguments made by myself and others upon the subject of this amendment. It is not different in purpose and effect from the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. If this amendment should be adopted, it certainly would not be in line with the liberal policy which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader on that side of the House, declared it to be his desire to follow in dealing with the Philippines. It would be exactly the reverse. It would restrict the right of suffrage to a far greater extent than this bill proposes to do.

I hope that no friend of the Filipinos, no one who wishes to give to them the fullest control over their affairs, consistent with American sovereignty, will vote for this amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I have only two minutes. I will say to the gentleman that if the Filipinos he would cut out of voting in the Philippines were to come to the United States and settle in his State and become naturalized citizens thereof—for I understand in his State they have manhood suffrage—they would be permitted to vote there. The gentleman would therefore permit Filipinos to vote in Minnesota without requiring of them any knowledge of English and would not permit them to vote in the Philippines unless they could read and write English. The very statement of this proposition demonstrates the absurdity of it. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MILLER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, yeas 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding a new section after line 5, page 12:

"That all citizens of the United States who can qualify under clauses A, B, and C of the preceding section, and who reside in the Philippine Islands, shall have the right to vote for all elective offices and the right to be chosen to fill any office in said islands."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman if he is disposed to accept that?

Mr. JONES. I am not.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the committee appreciates the very difficult position the American citizen will be in in the islands unless some such provision as that is accepted. This provision was brought to my attention very forcibly by people whose interests in the islands are very great. I certainly think an American citizen living in the islands, paying property tax and qualified in every way, ought to have the right to vote without renouncing his citizenship in the United States.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, just one minute. I am opposed to any man voting in the Philippine Islands who is not a citizen of the Philippines. I object to an American retaining his citizenship and his right to vote in the United States and at the same time exercising the right to vote in the Philippine Islands. I am as much opposed to an American doing this as I would be opposed to an Englishman or a German or a member of any other nationality doing it. It would be outrageous to permit such a provision as this. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I want to occupy but one minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for just a word?

Mr. JONES. I have but two minutes in which to discuss the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment as a new paragraph in this section, to come in between lines 5 and 6. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 5, insert the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section except as to sex shall be eligible to vote in school elections and on all candidates for school director or other offices whose sole official function is connected with education."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have used one minute, because I have another amendment to offer. I merely want to state, so that every Member will understand, that this simply allows women to vote in school elections. We had that provision in the State of Washington before we gave universal suffrage to women, and I understand other States have that provision. A large number of the teachers in the Philippine Islands are women. Women are eligible to do the teaching, women are eligible to train the children, and why should they not be allowed to vote on problems affecting purely and simply elections of school directors and other similar officers. On such matters this limited and qualified suffrage ought by all means to be granted, and I think that if Congress, having already gone on record against universal suffrage, also goes on record against this qualified suffrage, it will take a step that is so remote and so resembles the cliff dwellers that Congress ought to be ashamed of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, yeas 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 5, insert the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section except as to sex shall be eligible to vote in all elections if she owns real property to the value of \$500 or annually pays \$30 or more of established taxes."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have used one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make a point of order against that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is in effect precisely the same proposition which was offered on Saturday last and to which a point of order was sustained by the then occupant of the chair. There is no difference whatever in it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair wants to hear me on the point, I will say this amendment is different. This amendment takes up the matter of women voting who own property, just as the amendment preceding took up the question of women voting in school elections.

Now, for the Chair to rule that it is in order for us to take up amendments here as to various phases of citizenship, but because we have decided that universal suffrage shall be extended only to men that it is out of order for us to raise this question of qualified suffrage to women who own property, is, it seems to me, utterly illogical. The fact that some other occupant of the chair has made some other ruling in reference to some other amendment in some other place in the bill, does not make any difference. This Chairman certainly ought to be asked to make a ruling, simply because universal suffrage is extended only to males; that it is out of order to add a provision that when women own property they may vote; and while from the Democratic standpoint, while from the standpoint of the gentleman who has just spoken, it may be considered impolitic or a bad amendment, it certainly is in order for us to fix that qualification. Although the State of Louisiana, for instance, has a provision for male suffrage, it nevertheless has

a provision giving women who own property the right to vote on certain things.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] if he will send to the desk the amendment to which he refers, against which a point of order was sustained.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the Chair has before him the Record of the proceedings of Saturday last, it is in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the Record.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. On page 16439, at the top of the second column, is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN]. If the Chair will hear me a moment, I think I can state briefly the contention about it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment providing for female suffrage in every instance coming within the provisions of this section where male suffrage is permitted. That opened up the entire question, and was voted down by the committee. That covered every phase of it.

Now, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] subsequently offered an amendment to one of these sections, which the Chair has before him, and that amendment appears at the top of page 16439. The point of order that I made against that amendment was that the exact proposition involved in his amendment has already been voted upon by the committee. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] had offered his amendment that was offered on Saturday, or if he had offered the amendment which he now offers, prior to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it would not have made the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois out of order, because it was broader than that offered by the gentleman from Washington; but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois brought the whole question before the committee. It was voted upon and passed upon. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] can offer the amendment which he has just offered, then he can again open up another paragraph and nullify the complete proposition that was decided by the committee by the rejection of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. In other words, it is simply a repetition of that which the committee has already passed upon; and upon the theory that we must at some time, somewhere, be rid of these matters and make progress, I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], was to extend the right of franchise to women of all classes; all women who could come in under class A; all women who could come in under class B, the property qualification clause; and all women who could come in under class C, the literacy qualification clause. It was a general, comprehensive amendment. That offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is very much less in extent. It contemplates extending the franchise to just one of the three classes.

I trust that I can get the point that I have in mind before the Chair. The amendment which the gentleman from Illinois offered extended the right of franchise to women of three classes. It was voted down. Now it is proposed to extend the right of franchise to one of the three classes. The query is, Does the previous action of the House in respect to all three classes prevent consideration of an amendment embracing one class? I would like to read to the Chair some comments of the patron saint of Democracy, Thomas Jefferson, in his Manual, on a situation precisely like this:

A motion is made to amend by striking out certain words and inserting others in their place, which is negatived. Then it is moved to strike out the same words and to insert others of a tenor entirely different from those first proposed. It is negatived. Then it is moved to strike out the same words and insert nothing, which is agreed to. All this is admissible, because to strike out and insert A is one proposition.

That is the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois.

To strike out and insert B is a different proposition—

That is the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Washington—

and to strike out and insert nothing is still different. And the rejection of one proposition does not preclude the offering of a different one.

Now I find that precise question has been before the House or the committee and has been passed upon. Section 5769 of volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents reads as follows:

5769. A motion to strike out certain words being disagreed to, it is in order to strike out a portion of those words. On March 2, 1904, the District of Columbia appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the following amendment was proposed and disagreed to:

"Strike out, in line 1, page 15, the words 'register of wills,' and in line 2 the words 'and the police court.'"

Thereupon Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH of Michigan moved to strike out the words "and the police court" in line 2.

Mr. Macenas E. Benton, of Missouri, suggested the point that the amendment had already been voted on.

The Chairman held:

"The Chair will remind the gentleman that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] was to strike out the words 'register of wills' in the first line and the words 'and the police court' in the second line. No one called for a division. The proposition offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] to strike out simply the words 'and the police court' is a different proposition. Perhaps it would have been better to have called for a division of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, but that was not done, and the Chair must hold that this is a different proposition—one which has not been acted upon. The question, then, is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Again, in section 5570 it says:

It is in order to perfect words proposed to be stricken out by striking out a portion of them.

It seems to me very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the committee in disagreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was one proposition, and this offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is clearly another.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order for a moment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] may or not be important. That depends on one's point of view. But the question as to what shall be the rule of the House of Representatives with regard to amendments is certainly very important from everyone's standpoint. It is true that on Saturday the Chair made a certain ruling. My own impression is that the Chair had made his ruling before he clearly understood what the proposition was, and while the gentleman who then occupied the chair is an exceedingly fair man it is sometimes a little difficult, even for a Chairman, to adjust himself to new light that may come to him.

Now, this is the proposition, and it strikes me as being so clear and important that it would be a very great misfortune if we should establish a rule here which is certain to plague us in the future.

What is the situation? This bill has three sets of qualifications for electors—first, those who have held office; second, those who own property of a certain amount; third, those who are able to read and write. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] favored allowing women of all these classes to vote. The committee voted down that proposition. The committee might have been in favor of allowing women who had formerly held office to vote; they might have been in favor of women owning property to vote; a majority of the committee might have been in favor of allowing women who are educated to vote. The committee might be in favor of one or two of these propositions and yet not be willing to allow all three classes of women to vote.

Now, if we are to hold that a blanket amendment, if offered, precludes all separate amendments on different propositions, this is what is likely to occur: Some one opposed to any amendment whatever may rise and offer a blanket amendment, realizing or believing or hoping or expecting that the blanket amendment will be voted down, and by so doing prevent the committee from exercising its judgment and expressing its opinion with regard to one or more clear and concrete propositions included in the amendment.

We certainly do not want to establish that sort of a situation in the House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] does not desire it any more than the balance of us do. The object of the rule is to give the House an opportunity to express its opinion. The gentleman from Tennessee says if you allow this, then there is no end to the amendments that may be offered. Oh, yes; there is; and the end is well in sight. There are three different propositions. A general amendment could be offered covering them all, and then, from my view of the matter, it would be permissible to offer three other amendments covering each one of these classes; and that is the end of it; and that is not so long and wearisome a road that we need be disturbed about traveling it if we desire to give the committee an opportunity to express its opinion or its view.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has already offered two amendments, so far as that is concerned; but does not the gentleman conceive that in its ultimate effect it would bring the committee to vote twice upon precisely the same question?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all; and I think the Chair will have no difficulty in understanding the propositions involved. It is proper to offer a general amendment, covering a variety of

conditions, and certainly the offering of such an amendment should not preclude the offering of amendments that cover only part of the subject matter covered by the general amendment. I have already called the attention of the Chair to the effect of such a holding. It would give some one opposed to any amendment an opportunity to offer a general blanket amendment, and thus defeat the will of the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is impossible to word a special amendment affecting one of these particular subdivisions or classes so that you can insert it in this first paragraph, where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] sought to amend. Here it says "every male citizen," and so forth, and you can not put a specific amendment in there ahead of the classes A, B, C and do it so that it will be intelligent. The specification for qualified suffrage must be put after the first paragraph, whether the specification refers to man suffrage or woman suffrage.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has suggested that had the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offered his amendment first, a specific amendment covering but one class, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] might have offered a general amendment following that. By what curious process of reasoning the gentleman arrives at that conclusion and then insists that you can not turn the thing the other way around, I can not understand. Of course the amendment referring to one particular class could have been offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and another amendment referring to another class might have been offered by him or some one else, and another amendment referring to another class might have been offered by some one else. Those three amendments would have covered the whole ground, and then a general amendment perhaps would not have been in order, although there may be some question about that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman if, when the general amendment was offered to which he refers, it would not have been perfectly competent for either the gentleman from Washington or the gentleman from Minnesota to have asked that that be divided and that each proposition be voted upon separately; and if that was done, would not his object have been accomplished?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think a demand for a division could have been made, because as presented it was not divisible. Possibly it could have been amended in a way to cover only one or taking in two classes, in which event certainly another amendment could have been offered that would have taken in the other class or the other two classes or a general amendment. Mr. Chairman, it is very dangerous, and would establish a rule that we would all regret—a rule that would rise to plague us many times in the future—if it were held and became the rule of the House that a general amendment could be offered covering a variety of subjects, and then no specific amendment covering a portion of the subject, or one feature of the subject, could thereafter be offered. It would be very easy for a designing person to prevent amendments and prevent the committee from expressing its view and opinion by doing that very thing.

Mr. BRYAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois was to strike out the word "male"; and if somebody wise in procedure will tell me how to divide that, I will learn something.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, clearly that amendment would not have been divisible on any theory of parliamentary law with which we are acquainted. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] could give us some explanation of how it could be done.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to me. The gentleman himself spoke of a general amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and I submit that that was subject to a division.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are talking now about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The present occupant of the chair has proven himself in other days worthy and qualified to pass judgment intelligently upon these subjects. I am sure that he is well qualified to pass upon this subject, and I am taking the time of the Chair because of the fact that this is an exceedingly important proposition. It is not a matter that may be decided one way or the other without seriously affecting the business of the House. It is a matter that is far-reaching; and a decision such as is suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee would place us in a

position where the hands of the committee would be tied. The opportunity of the committee to express its opinion would be prevented. Rather than have that condition arise, we might better spend a few moments discussing and voting upon various amendments.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair has the bill before him and will turn to page 11, line 15, he will see the language of the bill—

Every male citizen of the Philippines 21 years of age—

And so forth.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment at that point to strike out the word "male," so that it would then have read:

Every citizen of the Philippines—

And so forth.

Now, in the nature of the case, every citizen must be either male or female, and the whole is equal to and includes all of its parts, and therefore the committee in its wisdom, having voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], thereby in effect says that female suffrage in the Philippine Islands will not be permitted or authorized by this bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The committee did not say that.

Mr. HELM. Yes, it did. The effect of the Mann amendment was that every female over 21 years of age, who has resided in the Philippine Islands for one year and in the municipality for six months, and possessing the qualifications set forth in subsections a, b, and c should be permitted to vote.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right; that is what Mr. MANN proposed, and the committee said that everyone and every kind shall not be permitted—

Mr. HELM. I did not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRYAN. But it did not say that a certain kind should not be permitted to vote.

Mr. HELM. The Mann amendment said, in effect—I will repeat it—that every female in the Philippine Islands over 21 years of age possessing the qualifications mentioned in sections 15 and embraced in subsections a, b, and c should be permitted to vote.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right.

Mr. HELM. The committee voted that down. And, now, how can you come back and say that some woman of the Caucasian race or some woman who pays \$15 taxes or some woman who has held an office or some woman who reads and writes the Spanish language shall be permitted to vote?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. In just a moment.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will put in there, under all sections; but the committee has not expressed—

Mr. HELM. The committee is on record as being opposed to female suffrage in the Philippine Islands—

Mr. MONDELL. As a whole.

Mr. HELM. (continuing). No matter whether the woman pays \$15 taxes, no matter whether she can read and write Spanish or read and write English or whether she can read or write a native language or whether she has been one of those Spanish officers, whose names I can not pronounce—every one has been excluded.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me. What the committee has done is to vote down an amendment giving universal suffrage, but the committee has not expressed itself on the question of limiting suffrage at all.

Mr. HELM. It has excluded every one of them.

Mr. MONDELL. That is what I wanted to call the attention of the chairman to—

Mr. HELM. The committee says woman suffrage shall not prevail in the Philippine Islands. How can you now, in the name of common sense, say any particular kind of woman shall vote? Now, just one other word. The regular chairman of this committee has gone on record after this matter has been argued as fully and as thoroughly and as completely as it has been argued here, and if we are going to continue this merry-go-round, one day riding the pony and the next day the sleigh, around and around, we will never get anywhere, and in the interest of business and in the interest of orderly procedure I think it ought to be disposed of without any further waste of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] provided that all women included in all of the sections of the bill should have the right to vote in the Philippine Islands. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] provides that certain women owning so much property or paying so much taxes shall be permitted to vote. The Mann

amendment covered all women in the Philippine Islands, those owning property as well as those not owning property, those who do not pay taxes as well as those who do pay taxes, and in view of the fact that the Mann amendment covered all women in the Philippine Islands, it is perfectly clear in the opinion of the Chair that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is not in order, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. There is only one minute's debate on that amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chair if all time under the agreement has not been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has two minutes and the gentleman from Virginia has two minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. I have only used one minute. I have not spoken except on the first amendment and since then except on the point of order. I have four minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not the gentleman offer two amendments?

Mr. BRYAN. I offered two amendments, but was not permitted to debate the second one at all. The point of order was raised on it before I spoke a second. If I had been permitted to speak on it, it would have been too late to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that he is mistaken. The gentleman is entitled to four minutes. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph in section 15, between lines 5 and 6 on page 12, the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section, except as to sex, shall be eligible to vote on all propositions submitted to the people on the incurring of indebtedness or the issuance of bonds if she owns real property to the value of \$500 or annually pays \$30 or more of established taxes."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be notified when I have used one minute. This amendment provides for the voting of women who own property only on questions of bonded indebtedness and on the incurring of indebtedness. You have provided that a man can ride in there on a horse, or a donkey, or anything else, and if he pays \$15 tax on that particular property he can vote, but a woman, no matter how much property she owns, can not vote; and you say it is out of order to think about it. You would not permit an amendment, so absurd from your viewpoint, to be even considered. It is ruled out of order.

Now, this proposition is that at a special election on a matter of bonds, or the incurring of indebtedness which would tax the property of a woman for which the authority of the electorate is necessary, in such a case the woman owning the property possessing all the qualifications for suffrage except that she is a woman, may, notwithstanding that impediment, be allowed to vote. That certainly is a right that ought to be recognized. It was adopted in Louisiana over 10 years ago, I know. The women who own property and pay taxes vote on the question of the issuance of bonds down there, and in any civilized community you should not tax a woman and then refuse to let her vote as to whether or not her property shall be taxed, in a special election held for the very purpose of determining whether such unusual indebtedness shall be incurred and such bonds be issued.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, I have one more amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, as a new paragraph to section 15, after line 5, on page 12, the following:

"The Philippine Legislature is hereby authorized to extend the right of suffrage to female citizens at any time hereafter."

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, you say that this bill is designed to give the Filipino independence. You say that you are going to let the Filipino govern himself and you are going to open the door to removal of the jurisdiction of the United States. But you have a provision here that even though every member of the Philippine Legislature should want to pass a law letting women vote where they own property, letting women vote in school elections where women do most of the teaching, letting women vote on bond issues where they own property, and under various other conditions, or letting them have universal suffrage, even if every gentleman is like the distinguished gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON], and all

members of the legislature like him favor the women in this matter, nevertheless the strong hand of the United States Government comes down and says, "No; you shall not permit the women to vote under any conditions in the islands, notwithstanding the fact that we boast about giving you independence, notwithstanding that we boast about giving you liberty. Have we not mothers? Do we not know that women voting will disturb the conditions over there? Have we not mothers and wives and sisters, and do we not know that women voting will promote immorality in the islands? Have we not observed the female characteristics, and do you suppose that we are going to allow you to permit women to disturb your political conditions and infuse immorality into your politics? No; we will not permit it! What do women know about education? What do women know about taxation, even if they do own the property? We want you to have self-government, but we will never permit you to bring such a calamity down on your heads as would come to all your institutions from permitting your wives and mothers and sisters to vote. Never!"

I hope this committee will come to their senses on this thing. Every one of these votes, including the one for universal suffrage, have been characterized by this feature, that the Democratic side of the aisle is the only side where that kind of votes can be had, and we have a demonstration in this Congress to the effect that there is only one party that stands practically unanimous against the mothers and the wives and the sisters, so far as political rights are concerned. [Applause.]

You have not only gone on record against votes for women in the Philippines on the same terms as men, but you have voted against permitting taxpaying women to vote merely at special elections where no subject is up for consideration except "Shall we vote bonds and extra taxes," for railroad help, for waterworks, for light plant, or other public works. A man may be drunk and a pauper, but he can vote, if he can read or ever held an office; but a woman may own her home and a substantial business, and may have been a college teacher the greater part of her life, and she can not vote even as to taxes. Ignorant men may vote on school elections and school bonds; but the very teachers themselves, who are women (and most of them are), can not vote even at a school election. Mothers and widows can not vote at school elections.

Then you go further, and say that you will not permit the Philippine Legislature to grant any kind of qualified suffrage to any woman at any time, even if every member of the legislature desires such legislation. You tie the legislature's hands by making it impossible for the insane, the criminals, and women to vote. What becomes of your State-rights talk. Here you deny it as a right of the Filipino to determine this matter, although you allow him to determine very nearly every phase of local government.

The Democratic Party is an enemy of woman suffrage in the State, in the Nation, in the islands, anywhere and everywhere. You will be the only party in the next presidential campaign whose platform does not contain a plank for equal suffrage. I am in hearty sympathy with the movement of the Congressional Union to hold the party responsible in the 10—soon to be 14—suffrage States for this. No individual is responsible; it is a great party that is blocking the way to equal suffrage, and I congratulate Miss Paul, of the Congressional Union, for locating the trouble. Suffrage workers in the suffrage States should apply the remedy.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this question. Almost the whole of Saturday was occupied in discussing the suffrage matter, but I do wish to say to the gentleman who has just spoken that it does not lie in the mouth of any gentleman on that side who has assailed this bill to charge the Democrats—those who favor it—with inconsistency. I think the gentleman himself voted to restrict the suffrage in the Philippine Islands to those who could read or write English or Spanish. After having cast that vote, it does not lie in the gentleman's mouth to talk about the Democrats not being liberal toward the Philippines.

Mr. BRYAN. I was talking about the liberty of the women.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division in order to see where they stand up.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. That for the purposes of the first election hereafter to the Philippine Legislature, the Philippine Islands shall be divided by the

Philippine Commission into 12 senate and ninety representative districts. In establishing senate and representative districts the commission shall establish in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly one senate and nine representative districts. The first election hereafter shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1915, and there shall be chosen at such election senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature: *Provided*, That the Governor General of the Philippine Islands shall appoint, without the consent of the senate and without restriction as to residence, senators and representatives who will, in his opinion, best represent the senate district and those representative districts which may be included in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly: *Provided further*, That thereafter elections shall be held only on such days and under such regulations as to ballots, voting, and qualifications of electors as may be prescribed by the Philippine Legislature, to which is hereby given authority to redistrict the Philippine Islands and modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TOWNER: Page 12, line 13, after the word "districts," strike out all the remainder of the line, all of line 14, all of line 15, all of line 16 down to and including the word "Legislature," and insert in lieu thereof "The first election under the provisions of this act shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1915, and there shall be chosen at such election one senator from each senate district for a term of three years and one for six years. Thereafter one senator from each district shall be elected from each senate district for a term of six years. That at said first election each representative district shall elect one representative for a term of three years, and triennially thereafter."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to move that the committee do now rise in order to get in a formal matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAIR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEASING OF COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further conference asked by the Senate on the Alaskan coal bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, be agreed to, and that two new conferees be appointed in lieu of the two that are absent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate on House bill 14233, and that new conferees be appointed on account of the absence of two conferees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the precedents, I believe the bill is still in conference, and if it were not for the absence of two of the House conferees, the House conferees could proceed with this matter without any action on the part of the House. I wish to be advised by the Speaker if that is not the ruling of Speaker Cannon?

The SPEAKER. Which side has the papers?

Mr. FERRIS. The Senate.

The SPEAKER. The House can not do anything in regard to the conference until the Senate gets through with the papers. It may be that the first half of the gentleman's request is surplusage, but the last half is necessary because two of the conferees have gone away.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understood from the proceedings that the conference report was rejected in the Senate on a point of order.

The SPEAKER. It was rejected by the Senate, and the Senate asked for a new conference. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks that we agree to the request of the Senate for a new conference, and the Chair will appoint the new conferees. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Under the special rule the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 18459, with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] in the chair.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is again in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 18459—the Philippine bill.

Mr. TOWNER. The amendment I offered, Mr. Chairman, is merely a perfection or continuation of the amendment which was discussed the other day with regard to the election of senators and representatives, making the term of senators six years, forming a continuous senate, electing one-half of them every three years, and fixing the term of members of the assembly at three years.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] assures me that that is the amendment we agreed upon, and I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWNER:

"Page 12, line 16, after the word 'Legislature,' strike out the remainder of line 16, all of line 17, all of line 18, all of line 19, all of line 20, all of line 21, all of line 22, and the words 'Philippine Assembly' in line 23, and insert, at the end of the section, as a new section, to be numbered '16a'."

Mr. HELM. I will ask the gentleman where that amendment is inserted in the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. It is to strike out the provision for the representation of the inhabitants of non-Christian territory. I will say to the gentleman, and to insert the provision which I introduced in the committee for a commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not reported the real amendment yet that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] intended to offer. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16a. That the provisions of this bill shall not be applied to the territory occupied by nor to the people known as the Moros or other non-Christian tribes. That such peoples and non-Christian tribes shall be allowed to maintain their tribal organization and government subject to the provisions of this section. That the government of the territory now occupied by the said Moros and other non-Christian tribes and of said peoples is hereby committed to a commission to be known as the Philippine Commission, to consist of three persons to be appointed by the President by and with the approval of the Senate of the United States and the Governor General or Acting Governor General of the Philippines. That said three members so appointed shall receive a salary of \$5,000 each, and shall hold their offices for four years and until their successors are appointed and qualified. That said commission shall have such powers in general, except as modified by existing conditions, as were granted to the commission appointed by the President of the United States by the order of April 7, 1900. That said commission shall have power to transfer from time to time such territory and peoples to the government and jurisdiction of the Philippine Government, as provided for in the preceding sections of this act, by and with the consent of the Philippine Legislature. That any tribe or people of such Moros or other non-Christian tribes, sufficient in number and of such contiguous residence as to constitute an entity capable of municipal organization which shall desire to be admitted to the jurisdiction of the Philippine Government established in preceding sections of this act, and who shall present a petition, signed by a majority of the males over 21 years of age of such tribe or entity, to that effect to the Philippine Legislature, may be admitted upon the acceptance of the transfer or jurisdiction by the Philippine Legislature and the approval of the President of the United States. The right to amend, modify, or repeal this section is hereby reserved to Congress without in any way affecting the other provisions of this act.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman if we can not agree to some little time for debate on the proposition?

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman think 10 minutes would be sufficient?

Mr. JONES. I think that would be sufficient for me, but other gentleman on this side will want time. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] want time on this question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. This is one of the most important paragraphs, if not perhaps the most important paragraph, in the entire bill. This is one, and coupled with it there is one that deals with a kindred subject, namely, the government of the non-Christian tribes, and it ought to be discussed at some considerable length.

Mr. JONES. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the debate on this subject be limited to 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. On this particular amendment alone?

Mr. JONES. Yes. There will be another one.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. MILLER. Make it 25 minutes.

Mr. JONES. We are getting along so awfully slowly—

Mr. STAFFORD. But this is very important.

Mr. JONES. I will say 25 minutes, if the gentleman suggests it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Twenty minutes of that time to be controlled on this side?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; half on that side and half on this.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can not agree to that.

Mr. TOWNER. It will be impossible for me to speak upon this amendment and explain it in less than 10 minutes' time, as the gentleman himself knows.

Mr. JONES. I said 25 minutes at the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TOWNER. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. JONES. Then I will say 30 minutes. That certainly is abundant time for one amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. How is the time to be divided?

Mr. JONES. Half and half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that debate on the amendment now before the committee be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by himself and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Is there objection?

Mr. TOWNER. I shall object, Mr. Chairman. We shall want 20 minutes on this side.

Mr. JONES. Then I will not agree to any time now.

Mr. TOWNER. Very well; let the gentleman make a motion on the proposition.

Mr. JONES. We will take it up later.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the most important and difficult question regarding the government of the Philippine Islands, that which relates to the government of the non-Christian tribes. I presume it is well known that in the Philippine Islands there are variously estimated at from seven hundred thousand to a million people who belong to non-Christian tribes. These consist of natives of the islands ranging from the very lowest degree of intelligence to those who are capable of understanding their own native languages, most of them maintaining their independent tribal forms of government, and all of them being non-Christian, pagans, or Mohammedans. The Negritos are of the very lowest order of manhood and womanhood in the islands, and are among the lowest orders known in the entire world. They are the so-called dwarfs, and, so far as we know, are practically incapable of civilization. The Igorotes are another tribe, very much higher in the scale, but still maintaining almost entirely a separate tribal organization, which has been slightly modified during the American occupancy. They are the old head-hunters and still retain a great many of their ancient characteristics. Then there is a very large group, the most important and the largest of the non-Christian tribes, the Moros or Moors. They are entirely distinct from the others. They profess and are very strongly devoted to the Mohammedan religion. They are a very warlike people, and have been able to keep up their independent organization against the rest of the islands, as well as against the Spaniards when they were in the occupancy of the islands. All of these different tribes have been governed down to the present time by what may be called a commission. Their government has always been separate and apart from the general government of the Philippine Islands. They have never been subjected to the same form and kind of government as have the rest of the islands.

It is now proposed by the terms of this bill to bring these people under the general government of the Philippine Islands; in other words, to the government of the Filipinos. More than half of the territory of the entire islands is occupied by the non-Christian tribes. It is proposed that they shall be represented in the Philippine Assembly, not by persons elected by themselves, because in most part that would be manifestly impossible, in fact, ridiculous; but they are to be represented by representatives who are to be appointed by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and in this way they are to be subjected to the general Philippine Government which we are instituting in this bill. In other words, the Legislature of the Philippine Islands will have the power to bring these people absolutely under its control. It is true that there is a bureau provided for afterwards in this bill, but that is administration only and does not change the fact that the power of legislating for all the non-Christian territory and all the non-Christian tribes is in the hands of the Philippine Legislature under the terms of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be used on that side and 15 minutes on this side. Gentlemen on that side have already had 5 minutes, and that will give them 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the provision that the majority of the committee have put into this bill is as wise a provision as could have been made for the government of the non-Christian territory and tribes if they are to be subjected to the government of the Philippine Legislature. However, I am absolutely certain that it will be exceedingly unwise to attempt to do this. In the first place, it will bring into the politics of the Philippine Islands an element of discord that will, in my judgment, make issues that ought, if possible, to be avoided. It is a responsibility which we ought not to place upon the legislature at this time. It is injecting into the future politics of the islands questions which they ought not to be called to pass upon.

That is one side of the question. On the other side is the still more important question that between the Negritos, the Igorotes, the Moros, and the Philippine people there is and has been for years, I might say for centuries, an intense hatred. That has been occasioned by the many acts of hostility that have occurred between them. It is ingrained in the very nature of all these non-Christian tribes. One of their most pronounced characteristics is that of hostility against the Filipinos. I can not take the time to give testimony regarding that, which might be given almost ad libitum. Time and time again these people, when they have been visited by Members and others, have said that they were willing to submit to the government of Americans, but they were unwilling under any circumstances to submit to the government of Filipinos. I believe that it would lead almost surely and certainly to revolt and revolution on the part of the Moros if Philippine oversight, supervision, and control and government were to be put in the hands of the legislature. If it be understood by them that they were afterwards subject to the control of the Filipinos, I do not believe that there would be any more peace in at least the southern half of the islands.

I have provided in this amendment which I offer, Mr. Chairman, for a commission to be appointed that shall have the control and government of this territory, so that in form, and for the present at least, the same form of government to which they are now subject shall be continued. The civil government which has been constituted now may be continued, so that from time to time, whenever it may be desired by the people themselves, of any part of this territory, they may be set aside from the non-Christian territory and become a part of the Christian territory. By these provisions they may themselves determine when they desire to come under the control of the Philippine Government. Eventually, as we all believe and hope, there will be unity in the government of the Philippines; but now it will not hasten—it will rather postpone—that day if we endeavor to force upon them the subjection, as they will view it, of their territory and their tribes to the Philippine Legislature. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit the statement just made on this floor, that there is hatred between the non-Christian Filipinos on the one hand and their Christian brethren on the other, to pass unchallenged. The statement is not new. It has several times heretofore been circulated from one end of this country to the other, and has been accepted by many people in the very best of faith. Such a statement should not be allowed to go further without the most energetic protest on the part of those who know the true state of affairs in their own country.

The Moros in times gone by have sometimes invaded certain of the small villages inhabited by Christian Filipinos. It is also true that until a few years ago there were a handful of savages in the Philippines, known as head-hunters, who occasionally decapitated some Christian Filipinos. But it is not true, indeed it is very wide of the mark, to say that such happenings as these prove that there is any particular hatred or antagonism

between the Christian and non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines.

The lack of discrimination in forming opinions on Philippine issues shown by persons who habitually act otherwise on matters of personal moment to them is most astonishing. They seem to take at face value whatever they hear or read regardless of its soundness and without analyzing the motives that might have prompted the statement.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is a very able lawyer, and if he would only apply to the information or statement he probably thinks he has in support of his contention regarding the supposed hatred between Christian and non-Christian Filipinos some of the common and rudimentary principles of evidence he would at once discover that such testimony is by no means plausible—indeed, is absolutely unreliable.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that the Moros have attacked and killed Filipinos. We are told, moreover, that these Moros have again and again emphatically reiterated that they would forcibly resist any attempt at a government of their territory by the Christian Filipinos. We are further told that they love the Americans and are happy under their rule, and that they are begging to be permitted to continue to live under that rule. What are the facts? The fact is that while it is true that the Moros have attacked and killed some Filipinos, it was long ago that they did so. On the other hand, up to two years ago they have been in the habit of attacking and killing American soldiers. Why, Mr. Chairman, the number of the American troops killed by the Moros in their resistance to American control exceeded by far the number of Filipinos that they even attempted to kill in past years, not to say of those they actually did kill. That Filipino heads have become a part of the trophies of the head-hunters in times gone by is undoubtedly a fact; but, unfortunately, Spanish and American heads have also been taken to make up these trophies. What is the conclusion—the only logical conclusion—to be derived from these premises? That the Christian Filipinos were never singled out as the most desired victims of warlike Moros and head-hunting pagans, and that the Moro aversion to the Christian is a matter of religious fanaticism. It made no difference to these Mohammedans whether the victim was an American, a Spaniard, or a Filipino. All these bore the mark of the cross. With the savages their head-hunting occupation was a part of their superstition, and the color of the head mattered not.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of governing the Moros and other non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines is by no means as serious a matter as the question of governing the Indians which the Americans had to face in the early days of this Republic, and if the Christian Filipinos were given an opportunity to take care of their backward brothers they would demonstrate that the task did not even deserve to be termed a problem. In my opinion there is as much ground for the suggestion that the non-Christian Filipinos be placed outside the control of the Philippine Legislature as there would be for the suggestion that the Indians of this country should be beyond the control of Congress. There is more community of interest and race between the Christian and non-Christian Filipinos on the one hand than between the American Indians and the white Americans on the other.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will retard the final solution of this question. I am decidedly opposed to it, and I should be against the passage of this bill if that amendment were to be adopted.

I have already stated in my main speech on this bill that the plan of representation given to the inhabitants of the non-Christian tribes does not appeal to me; but that I have submitted to that proposal, because, after all, the number of the appointed members who are to represent the non-Christians is so small in comparison with the rest of the legislature that in practice the result will be that the whole of the Philippines will be under the control of the elected representatives of the Filipino people.

In support of the theory that there is a very deep antagonism between the Christian and the non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines there have been printed, Mr. Chairman, not only in the newspapers, but also in Government publications, alleged speeches made by Moro chiefs on different occasions. I have also read—it was not my good fortune to be present at the time—the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], informing this House of similar addresses delivered to him during his recent visit in the islands by some important heads of tribes and by prominent dattos among the Moros. It has always been a matter that puzzled me to find all these speeches and addresses as good pieces of literature as the best of our orators upon the floor of this House could present, for it was too difficult for an ordinary intellect

like mine to explain how uneducated people, some of them indeed thoroughly uncivilized, could match their oratorical qualities with highly educated men who made it their business to study and practice eloquence.

I wonder if the hand that penned these speeches was a gloved hand? I wonder if the translator of these speeches—for they were translated into English in order that they might be understood by the addressee—was really making a speech of his own? Be that as it may, we have on our side reason and eloquent facts that tell the situation more convincingly than any words, certainly than all these speeches and addresses. To these facts I wish to call the attention of the committee, so that it may learn something besides the old theory regarding the Philippine situation.

The Moro Province is to-day governed by a civil governor. No longer is the Moro constantly pursued by a man with a gun. A new law has been enacted since Gov. Harrison became Governor General of the Philippines for the administration of the affairs in the territory mainly inhabited by the Mohammedans. This change has taken place with the approval of the War Department, and the result demonstrates that the Moro lives peacefully under civil authorities and that the Moros can get along together with Christian Filipinos and can work hand in hand with them for their common welfare. The governor of the Moro Province, it must be said, is one of the ablest and most industrious American officials who ever landed on Philippine soil. If at all possible to govern the Moros through civil agencies, the man who has the qualifications to show its practicability is the man chosen by Gov. Gen. Harrison—Frank W. Carpenter.

Gov. Carpenter has been in full charge of the Department of Mindanao—that is the name given now to the old Moro Province, and it includes the territory in the island of Mindanao inhabited by pagans—for fully 10 months, and during that time there has been no disorder nor have the Moros ever risen in arms against their government. Gov. Carpenter was given definite instructions by the Governor General as to the policies he should pursue in governing the Moro country. He was told to make that country as much a real part of the Philippine Islands as any other Province of the archipelago. That meant that good and friendly relations between the Mohammedan and Christian Filipinos should be fostered and that the Moros should be as early as possible given the same opportunities for education, sanitation, and material development as the inhabitants of other Provinces of the archipelago.

Gov. Carpenter, with that quickness of mind that is his peculiar gift, grasped at once the task he was called upon to discharge, and, with the energy and determination with which he always enters on his undertakings, he saw to it that the instructions of Gov. Harrison were at once put into effect. And so we now have in the Moro Province more schools, more roads, better sanitation, and more cultivated land than there ever was before.

A spectacle doubtless astonishing to men who feel as does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is likewise offered—a provincial board administering subprovinces of the department of Mindanao and Jolo and composed of a Filipino as governor, a Mohammedan as third member, and an American as treasurer. How nearly true it is that the Moro hates to have anything to do with the Filipino, how much he dislikes any other government but a strong, purely American-controlled government, we can judge from the address which this Moslem third member delivered on the inauguration of the provincial government—of which he is a member by appointment of Mr. Carpenter. I shall call the attention of the committee to this paragraph of that speech:

He who thinks that it is impossible for the Moslem and the Filipino to live together in peace and participate together in the government is foolish and lacks wisdom.

We therefore see, Mr. Chairman, a Filipino and a Moro working together in the government of their common province, and this gives us the best evidence that the Moro and the Filipino do like each other and that they can live together not only peacefully but harmoniously.

With regard to the other non-Christian inhabitants of the archipelago I shall have very little to say. Even he who is most pessimistic as to the possibility of placing this people under the Philippine Government admits that in this case the difficulties are less than in the case of the Moros. I say without hesitation that there is no difficulty whatever in having this people governed by Christian Filipinos. Had a different policy been pursued by the former secretary of the interior in the management of the affairs of this people, they would have advanced more than they have thus far, and there would have been to-day a fully established intercommunication between them and the Christian Filipinos. The new secretary of the in-

terior is, thank God, wise enough to see that the old policy was wrong and injurious, and his new policy is to promote the intermingling of these pagans with the Christian Filipinos. He has appointed a delegate whose paramount duty is to bring about this result. Less appropriation for so-called scientific researches and more for the education, sanitation, and means of communication of this people is the watchword of Secretary Winfred T. Denison. In connection with this remark I wish to insert in the RECORD a quotation from an address delivered by Secretary Denison before the Manila City Club, as follows:

To be concrete: Within the last few days the question has come to me whether I would authorize the expenditure of \$500, more or less, for the photographing of mollusks.

Now, it happens that I have just returned from the Mountain Province where I found a deep necessity and a great demand for school-teachers and no money to provide them. I had this choice: Should I spend \$500 for photographing these mollusks, or should I spend it for a school-teacher? I could pay the whole share of the Insular Government in another teacher for the cost of these photographs. I am not unaware that the world outside of the Philippines may possibly prefer the photographs of the mollusks to teachers in the Mountain Province, but can there be any doubt in the mind of anyone that my duty is to spend that money for the interest of the Philippines, rather than to further what may be considered the interest of the scientific world at large?

This is a type of the questions which are constantly arising. It is an extreme one, and one that is unusually ridiculous, but nevertheless it serves to make the point.

Every requisition for expenditure involves a choice of the purpose proposed as against all other possible purposes, and it behooves an alien administrator to have a care lest he gives the hobbies of his own nation priority over the interest of the people whose money he is spending.

PEOPLE WITHOUT MEDICAL CARE.

A similar thing happened in the first month I was here. I had been to Palawan, and had found there 40,000 people without a doctor. This gave me a shock which I shall never forget, and which has not been minimized by my having subsequently found the same thing on a still larger scale in the Mountain Province. I had visited the Moros in the southern end of Palawan, and had found them eager for a school-teacher—even grown men petitioning for leave themselves to go to school. I had been to the Cullion leper colony, and had received the petitions of those 6 sisters of St. Paul de Chartres who were doing all the nursing for 250 hospital patients and caring for the whole outpatient and dispensary service besides; and they had asked for 2 more nurses and \$50 a month for extra delicacies for the more desperate among their cases.

With these things in my mind I returned to Manila; and there the very first thing that came to me was an application for leave to spend \$14,000 for printing the results of ethnological research into the habits of the Bukidnons and other non-Christian tribes, and I said to myself: Is it for the interest of the Filipino people that these manuscripts should be printed at such a cost, rather than that school-teachers and doctors should be sent to Palawan and more help to those weary sisters of St. Paul de Chartres and the lepers in their care?

Is it for the interest of the Filipino people to make such researches and to print their results in order to inform the American people and the outside scientific world about the ways and habits of the Bukidnons, rather than to send school-teachers to teach the Bukidnons the ways of the outside world?

It was urged that these expenses for printing were a mere bagatelle compared with the cost of collecting the information, and that it was a pity to lose the results of these researches for a sum so small when compared with the vast total of cost already incurred in collecting the information.

But for \$14,000 I could either cover the Mountain Province with school-teachers or cover Palawan with doctors or fill Cullion with nurses, while the outside world, if it finds itself in peremptory need of this knowledge, may possibly be able to find the money somewhere except in the pockets of the Filipino people.

Then it was urged that the administrative officers of the Mountain Province, the governor, the lieutenant governors, and all the Americans who have to deal with those people up there, needed these researches to guide them in their work. That might possibly, to my mind, be a justification for the expense, so I set that question aside until I could visit the Province, and then I asked everyone of these officers the question, and I found that not one of them had ever made any practical use of any of these things. "Interesting," they said, "from the point of view of the advancement of the science of the world, but of no actual practical use to the Mountain Province."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has expired.

Mr. QUEZON. May I have one minute more?

Mr. JONES. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. QUEZON. The foregoing statement is very interesting, since it shows—at least by implication—what had been done before Secretary Denison's time, and was then heralded as the greatest thing certain men ever did.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Iowa will not press his amendment. The gentleman from Iowa knows that the Philippine Commission has absolute control over the Moro and non-Christian tribes, and that since the appointment by the President of a majority of Filipinos on the commission that the actual fact is that the Moros and other non-Christian inhabitants of the islands are absolutely governed by Christian Filipinos. Were it true that there was a dislike on the part of these Christian Filipinos for the Moros, it would have been plainly shown in the conduct of the present Philippine Commission; yet the fact is that although the revenues of the Philippine Islands have fallen off, and in spite of the absolute necessity for retrenchment, this Filipinized commission has appropriated more

money than ever for the pagans, and has given for the department of Mindanao and Sulu \$225,000; for Agusan, \$17,000; and for public works of general character to be carried out in these countries, \$27,225. With these concrete facts I believe the gentleman must be convinced of the lack of foundation for what he heard or read about antagonism between the Christians and non-Christians. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, of course, that to discuss an important subject like this in five minutes is entirely out of the question. I want to refer to one or two items in the time left to me. The gentleman from the Philippine Islands, who has just spoken, believes all that he has said or he would not have said it. I have that faith in his intellectual honesty. If there was one thing, however, that I found that surprised me more than any other, it was the absolute and complete ignorance of the Christian Filipinos in respect to the non-Christians in the Philippine Islands. While I think the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has stated the situation as he believes it, yet if he had been with me and visited the wild tribes—

Mr. QUEZON. Oh, I have visited them a good many times.

Mr. MILLER. My dear sir, without entering into any controversy about that, as a matter of fact the non-Christian people, whether they ought to or whether they ought not, do look with very great hostility upon the Christian people. There is no question about that at all; it is as plain and straight as that A, B, and C are the first letters of the alphabet. I think that condition is being removed. It is going to be removed, of course; but it exists to-day.

The gentleman from the Philippine Islands said something about the splendid results from establishing the civil government among the Moros. What he said is true. For several years they have been preparing the way to establish a civil government in the Moro territory.

They reached a condition of pacification in the Moro part of the islands such that a civil government was instituted about a year ago, and the man who has been put in charge is one of the very best men to be found for the purpose; but everybody knows this, that it was never dared to put that civil government into existence until after the Governor General publicly, before an assemblage of Moro datos, gathered at Lake Lanao, guaranteed to them that the civil governor would be an American and not a Filipino. I hope we can be correctly understood. That condition exists. It is a vital condition. It is being eradicated. There is no reason why Christian and non-Christian Filipinos should be fighting each other or should hate each other. The present resulting situation comes from previous ages and times of warfare and strife. They have not yet become acquainted with each other. When they do become acquainted with each other and recognize that they are children of the same race there will be a change in their condition, but the change is not now. If anybody should really desire to know just how a great many of the wild people feel there is plenty of literature in which they have expressed themselves. I myself have a great pile of manuscript, testimony taken down verbatim by a Christian Filipino stenographer, showing the ideas and desires of the wild men of the north, of the south, and throughout the islands. There was not a dissenting voice anywhere, from one end of the islands to the other, among those wild people, and while I am in favor of a system of government here that will gradually let the Christian Filipino have complete control over all of the territory, yet, it seems to me, to do so now without considerable restriction would be to permit a grave situation to result. As soon as the Christian Filipinos become better acquainted with the non-Christians and the non-Christians become better acquainted with the Christians, so that they know and understand each other and their purposes are found not to be hostile to each other, then you can have a result making possible the principle of this bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa may not meet exactly in every respect my own ideas—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with what has been said by gentlemen on the other side as to the difficulty surrounding this particular subject, but I can not agree that the Moros are as much averse to being governed by the Filipinos as has been stated, or that the Filipinos, having no sympathy for them, would not treat them fairly. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I wish to give to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] a concrete fact which I think will change, or at least ought to change, his opinion upon this subject. It is well known that the revenues of the islands have fallen off to such

an extent that retrenchment has become absolutely necessary, and yet the Philippine Commission, now under the control of the Filipinos, there being five Filipinos to four Americans, has increased the appropriations for Agusan, Nueva Vizcaya, and the mountain Provinces, and has granted a subsidy of \$112,500 to be used in the Moro Province, now called the Province of Mindanao and Sulu. This was done upon the motion of a Filipino member of the commission. As long as the commission was dominated by Americans no such thing as this ever occurred.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman explain further by saying what he means by the statement that nothing like that was ever done by the American commission?

Mr. JONES. I mean to say that the American commission has never granted a sum like that—a subsidy, as it were—to the Moro Province. The increased appropriations of which I have spoken—oh, the gentleman shakes his head, but it is absolutely true—were made for the wild tribes at the very time that the appropriations for the civilized Provinces were being cut down.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman must know that heretofore the whole Moro country has been military, and now there is a civil governor.

Mr. JONES. That has absolutely no bearing on the subject whatever. They have a civil governor now instead of a military governor.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. In other words, the Governor General of the Philippine Islands has selected as the governor of the Moro Province a civilian instead of a military man, as has been the case in the past. The Government itself has not been changed. The facts which I have stated constitute an absolute and irrefutable reply to the charges that have been so frequently made to the effect that the Filipinos, if given control of the Government, would neglect the interests of the wild tribes.

Mr. Chairman, further on in this bill, in the twenty-second section, it is provided:

There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Under this provision the administrative affairs of the non-Christian tribes will be cared for. There is no necessity for the appointment of a commission of three members at a salary of \$5,000 each, to be paid by the Filipino people. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions of this bill relating to the wild tribes gave the committee a great deal of concern. I, for one, consulted with a great many Americans familiar with affairs in the islands, and one of those was the former Vice Governor General, Mr. Gilbert. He thoroughly indorsed and approved these provisions of the bill, although he did not give his approval to one or two other provisions, particularly the preamble and the requirement of the confirmation by the senate of the appointees of the Governor General. I did not inform Gov. Gilbert as to all the provisions of the bill, and he might not have approved others; but he was outspoken in his approval of the one relating to the appointment of senators and representatives for the Provinces not now represented in the assembly. Gov. Gilbert has returned to the islands, I may add, to make his permanent home there. I have talked with no one familiar with governmental affairs in the Philippines who did not approve this provision save only one member of the supreme court, for whose judgment, I may say, I have great respect. Justice Trent alone of all those consulted by me was of the opinion that the provision contained in the bill was not the wisest solution of this difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, no one can doubt but that the Governor General will appoint high-minded, experienced, and able men to represent the wild tribes, that he will select the very best men that can be found. Such men will see to it that the interests of the wild men are not neglected. It is proposed to rid the Philippines of the Philippine Commission, which, under American control, became so odious to their people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the last statement which the gentleman from Virginia makes upon the floor of this House, that nearly everybody thinks the commission system of governing the non-Christian tribes ought to be abolished, is so absolutely far from the truth, in my judgment, that it is almost ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, it is ungracious always to say anything regarding people derogatory of them, and if the statement which I made had not been challenged on the floor regarding the feeling between the Filipinos and the non-Christian tribes,

I should not now read and put into the Record this testimony, but I am going to quote from two very good Democratic authorities, one of them the present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, and this is what he says:

It is common knowledge that deep hatred exists between the Igorrotes of the mountains and the Tagalogs of the plains, and that the Moros look with fanatical contempt upon the non-Moslem and physically weak dwellers in the seacoast cities. It did not need the plain statement of the Moro chiefs to Mr. Dickinson, that though they had laid down the bolo at the American command they would take it up again should the American leave, to show that the removal of the strong hand of law from the Moro people would mean a continuance of that riot and bloodshed which has for centuries prevailed where they were free to follow their natural training and habits. But let the Moros speak for themselves.

And remember, gentlemen, this is Secretary Dickinson, a Democrat, who was sent there for the express purpose of making this investigation.

At a meeting between the Secretary of War and the Moro leader at Jolo, August 24, 1910, the former secretary to the Sultan of Sulu was selected by the Moros to speak for them. He said:

"We have only a little to say, and that says we are happy to be under the sovereignty of the Americans. There has been some talking about that the Filipinos want to tear themselves off from the Americans and that they want to tear us away, too—tear us away with them. If the Americans should give the Moro country over to the Filipinos they would be responsible to God for the blood that would be shed, because it would be the same thing as if you put two fighting cocks into one bag, for there would be fighting, sure."

On August 23, 1910, a public meeting was held in the theater at Zamboanga, Island of Mindanao. At this meeting Datu Sacauran said:

"I am an old man. I do not want any more trouble. But if it should come to that—that we should be given over to the Filipinos—I still would fight."

He was followed by another leader, who said:

"I am not a civilized man, but I have learned that slavery, killing, and stealing is a bad thing; we do it no more. But if after that it should be that we shall be given over to another race we had better all be hanged."

The final speaker was Nadji Nungul, who spoke as follows:

"The Secretary of War must look the matter in the face. We are a different race; we have a different religion; we are Mohammedans; and if we should be given over to the Filipinos, how much more would they treat us badly when they treated even the Spanish badly who were their own mothers and their own fathers in generation? How did they treat them? Think about it. Think twice. We far prefer to be in the hands of the Americans, who are father and mother to us now, than to be turned over to another people."

And that is the feeling that now exists between the non-Christian tribes and the Filipinos.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Does that exhaust my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman is exhausted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has three minutes remaining.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has challenged the correctness of my statement that the Filipinos would treat the members of the wild tribes fairly if permitted to govern them and has read extracts from a speech delivered by the Secretary of Commerce upon this floor when he was a Member of this body to support his statement that they would not do so. I do not care to comment upon the statements in that speech. Immediately upon its delivery I made a reply to it, as the gentleman knows, or, if not, as he will find upon examining the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I need not repeat what I then said, but I stand by every word of that speech now.

But, Mr. Chairman, it has been several years since the Secretary of Commerce was in the islands. It has been several years since Secretary of War Dickinson, from whose report he quoted, was in the islands. I have furnished the House with concrete facts that absolutely overthrow and refute everything that has been said by those who hold that the Filipinos would not govern the wild men justly. I have shown that, despite the fact that it was said in the Philippine Islands when the Philippine Commission was Filipinized by President Wilson, it would result in the mistreatment of the wild tribes, the very reverse has been true. So far from those evil predictions materializing, the Filipinization of the commission has resulted in more being done for the wild tribes than had ever before been done for the improvement of their condition, and that at a time when the insular revenues were falling off and retrenchment was the order of the day throughout the civilized Provinces.

This statement the gentleman has not attempted to answer. It is a full and complete answer to the oft-repeated assertion that the Filipinos had no sympathy for the Moros, at least, and therefore ought not to be entrusted with their government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

In line 3, on page 13, I move to strike out the words following the word "Islands"—all the remainder of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 13, by striking out, in line 3, all of the section after the word "Islands."

The words stricken out are: "And modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask to have that amendment adopted is this: Not only does this section put into the hands of the Philippine Government that is now to be instituted under this bill the government of the non-Christian tribes, not only does it provide that they shall be represented in this section by representatives appointed by the governor general, but it expressly provides that the legislature of the Philippine Islands may modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section. In other words, it gives with one hand the power of representation, and on the other hand it withholds it whenever the Philippine Assembly may desire to do so. In other words, it allows the Philippine Assembly at its first meeting to pass a law under which the non-Christian population shall not be represented or to modify the representation in any way it desires. In other words, it leaves the government of the non-Christian territory and the non-Christian tribes exclusively in the hands of the Filipinos. The gentleman says that the Philippine Assembly is well qualified to take care of non-Christian tribes; that the Filipino people are more liberal than the Americans. The gentleman would really, I presume, cause the committee to believe, if he could, that there was no necessity in behalf of the non-Christian tribes for increasing the appropriations from year to year. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that fact is one of the reasons why these amendments ought to be adopted—that they have just begun the civilization of the non-Christian tribes. If anything is done such as it demanded, it will, of course, necessitate increasing expenditures from time to time.

The gentleman makes a great virtue of such action. They could do no less if they were doing anything like their duty. And it is not that. I do not charge that the Filipinos will not do what they think their duty is. I believe, though, that it is unwise to put this responsibility upon them now, this great problem, for it will be one; and I believe when it is thoroughly understood by the non-Christian tribes themselves that they are no longer subject to the immediate government of the Americans, there will be difficulty throughout all that territory. The present governor general of the Moros is an American. He stands there representing to them the American Government. In my judgment he is, perhaps, the wisest and best man that could be appointed for such place. In my judgment if he can not succeed in the civil government of the Moros, no man can succeed. But his place will be taken when this bill becomes a law, and whatever government will of necessity be established there will not be to them the Government of America as it is now; it will be the government of the Filipinos, which they so much dislike and which they so much fear. That is the danger, Mr. Chairman, in the situation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Committee on Insular Affairs in framing this bill was to give to the Filipinos the most autonomous form of government that could be framed. The majority members of the committee infinitely regret that they have not been able to frame a bill that meets the approval of all of the leaders on the other side of the House. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] does not at all agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of that side of the House, as to some of the provisions of this bill. The gentleman from Illinois stated that the only objection he had to the governmental features of this bill was that they were too illiberal. He said he wanted to extend to the Filipinos the fullest measure of self-government possible in order that they might demonstrate whether or not they were fit for self-government. The gentleman from Iowa thinks that we go too far, and that this bill ought to be so modified as not to permit the Philippine Legislature to change the provisions of this section. I do not agree with the gentleman from Iowa. Neither am I willing to go as far as the gentleman from Illinois professes to desire to go. I occupy a middle and, I hope, a more consistent ground than either of these gentlemen.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES. I believe that as to all questions relating to redistributing the islands and the apportionment of members for the legislature—the senate as well as the house of representatives—we can safely leave them to the Philippine Legislature.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Has he changed his mind from what it was a year ago when he introduced the first Jones bill? The bill provided a much larger measure of self-government to the islands, provided for independence absolutely at a time fixed, and yet now this bill does much less in granting power to the Filipinos and says not one word about fixing the time for independence.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, my answer is that I have stated more than once during the course of this debate that this bill did not fully represent my individual ideas as to Philippine independence. Personally I would prefer to fix in this bill, as in the former one, a definite date for Philippine independence. I believe that in the course of five or six years from now—and that bill provided for a probationary government to last for eight years—that the Filipinos will be entirely prepared to establish and maintain a government of their own. But, as I have said before, there are gentlemen of my own party who think that it is not best to fix a definite date for independence, and their opinions have weight with me. And I bow, and I bow gracefully, Mr. Chairman, to the dictates of my party upon this subject as expressed in the national Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman think this corresponds with the declaration of the great Democratic Party in the Baltimore platform?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. MILLER. What about neutralization?

Mr. JONES. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I can easily anticipate what he is going to say. I believe that an effort should be made to neutralize the islands, but I do not believe that that proposition should find a place in this bill, and I will say further to the gentleman that when the time comes, if it ever does, when it is possible to secure such neutralization an earnest effort will be made to do it. But the gentleman must realize that conditions in Europe are such to-day that it would be futile to attempt it at this time. The Democrats will bring forward a resolution when the time comes, having for its object the neutralization of the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more in which to answer a question which I wish to propound to him.

Mr. JONES. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question if I can, but my time has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Has not the question of the neutralization of the islands just as much a place in this bill as a declaration of our intent that we propose to give the islands their independence?

Mr. JONES. Not a bit of it. The gentleman does not wish to insert in the preamble of this bill a neutralization proposition, I think.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want any preamble in the bill at all. You have seen fit to put one in. Why not put the other in?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman wishes a neutralization measure incorporated in the body of this bill. To that I can not agree. There is no place in this bill for such a proposition. It must be a separate and independent measure.

Mr. MILLER. I am delighted that the gentleman has made such a splendid argument against his own preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, by striking out, in line 9, page 12, after the word "district," all the remainder of the paragraph down to line 23, to the colon before the word "Provided."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 12, by striking out all of page 12 after the word "district," in line 9, down to and including the word "Assembly," in line 23.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The first part of that has gone out. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offered an amendment covering that, and the first part of that has gone out.

Mr. MILLER. Then my amendment is perfectly proper.

Mr. JONES. You want to strike out, then, the amendment to this section which was adopted by practically unanimous consent. That section has been amended now, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota, Does his motion commence in line 9?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; line 9, after the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. That sentence might be considered separately in a motion, I will say; but it would not do to strike out the next sentence, because that would include the sentence that has been amended, and the amendment has been agreed upon.

Mr. MILLER. Did that amendment begin in line 19?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out after the word "district," in line 9, page 12, the remainder down to and including the word "district," in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, by striking out, after the word "district," in line 9, down to and including the word "district," in line 13.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the difficulty that the majority Members of the Committee were in when trying to frame some legislation that would give an appearance of looking after the interests of the non-Christian tribes, but I am not exactly in agreement with them in the idea that they have hit upon a happy solution. I think it is absolutely ludicrous. Opinions, of course, may differ, but that is the way it seems to me.

Let us see what this does. You propose to organize one senate district. That senate district would stretch over and touch almost every island in the whole archipelago; just where, we do not know. The territorial limits in the islands are not defined with accuracy in many places. There are two general classes of non-Christian territory, some that are purely non-Christian and some that are quasi Christian, like Nueva, Visaya, Palawan, and Mindoro. This makes one district for a thousand different places. I do not know, when a man is appointed, if he can ever find out just what his territory and district is. There are to be nine representatives. I suppose they could be so arranged that they would comprehend possibly most of the non-Christian territory. But it is going to be very dubious and difficult to locate those districts. But let us waive that, just to be good natured to-day. Is this a representative government? Oh, what a farce to put a provision like that in a bill and have it labeled "autonomy and self-government"!

Whom are these people representing? The answer will come back, "The non-Christian tribes." The chances are ten to one that the man appointed will never have seen the district or people that he represents. He knows nothing whatever about them. Representative government! Having the Governor General appoint two senators and nine representatives to represent some people that they do not know and have never seen?

Mr. HELM. Is not that what they have been getting?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, it is entirely different. I am perfectly frank to say that I believe in a change in the system that is now or has been heretofore in vogue in the islands, but this does not reach the situation. Not only is that true, but you are appointing new men. They are to be Filipinos, of course. I can just see the majority members of this committee shivering up their souls in holy horror at the thought of Americans sitting in the Filipino Legislature to represent these non-Christian people. I would not be in favor of that myself. But if you are going to have such a left-handed corkscrew system as that, by all means appoint Filipinos to it. But you can never escape the fact that when you appoint a Tagalo or a Viscayan or a Pangasinan or an Ilocano or a Bicol or a Cagayanese or a Zambalan to represent a Moro you are doing the same thing as though you to-day appointed a Frenchman to represent a constituency of Germans in a parliament. You would be appointing a man who would not at this hour dare to go to see his people, and I know whereof I speak.

But let us not dwell so much upon the Moros. Should you appoint an Ilocano to represent an Ifugao and tell him he had to go and consult with his constituent, that consultation would be short and interesting, and there are 125,000 Ifugaos. The same would be true of the Bontocs, the Kalingas, the Apayans, or the Benguets, or the people inhabiting Lepanto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like three minutes more. I should like to complete this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Now, I can see that the committee were up against a very difficult situation, and possibly in the extremity of their dilemma finally wrote this language into the bill. I am not surprised that no one of them has been able to stand on this floor and justify it. It permits of no justification. If the people whom you call non-Christian are not capable of self-government or participating in self-government, then shape your government so they will not, but do not go through the farce of putting into a bill the shadow of representation. Why, I am reliably informed that the present secretary of the interior recently said in an interview, which has been widely published—and he has not denied it—that he was in favor of giving the right of the franchise to the Tagbanuas. They live on the island of Palawan, and are among the wildest people to be found in the islands. I do not mean by that the most vicious or cruel, but they are among the wildest people to be found in the islands, with no more comprehension of voting than a Hot-tentot who had never seen a white man in his life. The idea is utterly ridiculous and nonsensical. The unfortunate part of it is that the present secretary of the interior happens to be the man in charge of the region. When he goes there and sees his people he will change his mind.

There is another element in this, Mr. Chairman, that I am astounded that democracy should champion. I have always understood that democracy stood for the freedom and the liberty of the individual and for the complete autonomy of each locality, for the divorce and separation of tyrannical power from the power of the people. But what have you here? You are permitting the Governor General to name two senators, his own personal friends, his henchmen, his dog Fido, and his dog Towzer, and nine representatives to sit in the legislative body, to influence legislation there, and they are the hands of the Executive and not the legislative branch at all. Did you ever hear of such a scheme of government as that? I know the chairman stated a fact when he said that he knows the vice governor general, Mr. Gilbert, liked this proposition. I will tell you why. He liked it because he saw that it would strengthen the hands of the Governor General, and for that reason alone. It will give him tremendous power and strength in the legislative branch, and here you are turning your backs upon the wisdom of your fathers, forsaking for all time the logic of your own minds, abandoning the experience of humanity, and thrusting the tyranny of the Executive upon the power of the representatives of the people in the legislative assembly.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it has been so long since I left college, so long since I studied Latin, that I hesitate to make use of Latin words. I believe the itch for writing is described in Latin as a case of *cacoethes scribendi*. I would therefore describe the disease with which the gentleman from Minnesota is afflicted as *cacoethes alteratus*, which I take to mean an itch for offering amendments. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELM. Let us have those words taken down. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have those words translated. I do not know whether I have been complimented or abused, and I think I have a right to know.

Mr. JONES. My translation of them is "an itch for offering amendments."

Mr. MILLER. Is that the translation of the gentleman's Latin?

Mr. JONES. My Latin may be bad, but if my translation of it is correct, then it correctly describes the disease with which the gentleman is badly afflicted.

Mr. MILLER. I think the gentleman's Latin was good, but his pronunciation was atrocious.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there is anything wrong about my translation.

Mr. MILLER. If I have anything of the kind described by the gentleman, I do not know where I caught it; but I have just been over on the Democratic side for the first time since I have been in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has correctly said that the government of the wild tribes in the Philippines presents a very difficult problem. We all concede that, but I want to assure the House that this proposition has received more careful consideration at the hands of the committee than perhaps any other, possibly all others in the bill together. It is the desire of the committee to provide the very best government that is practicable for the people of the wild tribes. We all realize that they are not capable, as are the inhabitants of the civilized and Christianized Provinces, to elect their officials.

The situation in the Philippines is a peculiar one, and it has to be dealt with according to the conditions which surround it. The committee have felt that the wild tribes ought to have representation in the legislature, and since it would be farcical to permit them to elect their representatives we decided that the very best that could possibly be done to protect their interests would be to have the Governor General appoint their representatives. This will certainly insure their being represented by men of character and ability who will understand their needs. The gentleman says they are willing to trust the Americans, and therefore I have no doubt but that they are willing to trust the American Governor General to appoint their representatives. I can not conceive of any better plan than that; and I want to say to the gentleman, who seems to be having some trouble with framing his amendment, that even if it were adopted it would leave the subject in a most unfortunate situation. It would strike out the provision which provides for dividing certain territory into one senatorial and nine representative districts, but would still impose upon the Governor General the responsibility and duty of appointing two senators and nine representatives.

Mr. MILLER. If the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment, I will offer one later to correct that difficulty.

Mr. JONES. It was not my intention to help the gentleman perfect his amendment, but just to call attention to the fact that if it were adopted it would leave the bill in an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Chairman. I ask for a vote.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Whatever might be our impression as to Philippine independence and local self-government, whether immediate or deferred, I think there is not a Member on either side that does not recognize that this non-Christian problem is the most delicate question we will have to consider. The committee in its consideration recognized that. There are two separate clauses which suggest the seriousness of the situation. I am quite certain that if you read these two provisions in the bill that you will find there is going to be a conflict here. The attempt to meet the Moro situation has resulted in a possible conflict of authority in the bill.

The delicacy of this situation is suggested in lines 16 to 23, which places legislative authority in the Governor General, through appointment, by making a special provision that is not found in other parts of the islands where the Philippine Assembly is wholly in control. The assembly thus constituted will be partly elective and partly appointive. That indicates that the non-Christian tribes really make a delicate situation in the government over there, which ought not to be too readily surrendered to a people not well disciplined in government. Then, on page 20, to which our attention was called awhile ago by the chairman, there is another provision which suggests the same thing. By this clause there is to be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau which is to have full control of the interests of these non-Christian sections. This bureau is a creature of the Philippine Legislature, while the representatives of these non-Christian people are creatures of the Governor General. Allegiance is to different authorities.

Now, the conflict I see in the bill that we had up before is that in the one case the representatives of the non-Christian tribes are to be appointed by the Governor General. There will be 9 of them, and that will be one-tenth of the legislature if there are 90 members, or not quite one-tenth of the whole, as the bill provides for 90 members from the Christian and 9 members from the non-Christian sections. The 9 are appointed by the Governor General and have the right to speak, to vote, and to hold office—in a word, the same right of any other member elected. The legislature is thus composed of elective and appointive members with the same rights in the body.

Then, on the other hand, there is to be a bureau created by the Philippine Legislature, and that bureau is to have full control of matters pertaining to the non-Christian tribes. In the first place, you will have nine members appointed by the Governor General to have a position in the legislature, and on the other hand we have here a bureau created by the Philippine Legislature to have full control.

Mr. JONES. Not to have full control. The bureau does not have any legislative authority; its authority is purely ministerial. There are some 23 or more bureaus there now through which the affairs that have been placed under these bureaus are administered. The legislature legislates as to these bureaus and the matters that pertain to them pass through the bureau.

Mr. FESS. The bill says:

And shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Mr. JONES. That language is put in there advisedly. The secretary of the interior had the same authority, but he was subject, of course, to the laws prescribed by the commission.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear yet in my mind that there may not be a conflict here, because the source of authority in the one place is elective and in the other it is appointive.

Mr. JONES. That difficulty suggested itself to my mind in the beginning, but I consulted with the officials in the War Department and this language was supposed to be the language which would best cover the situation.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the probabilities are that what was intended was to convey in the appointment of the bureau administrative power only, leaving the legislative power in the hands of the appointees of the government.

Mr. JONES. That was unquestionably the intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the principle of giving appointive offices legislative functions, I think, is more or less to be criticized. For example, we are to have nine members appointed by the Governor General without the consent on the part of the senate or any other body. They are to be given legislative functions. I fear we are going too fast in this legislation. I think it would be safer for us to still retain the authority over the non-Christian tribes in the government here rather than to put it over entirely into the hands of the Philippine Legislature. That is the serious question that we are discussing. I believe that if our concern is to move safely that we are going a little too rapidly here; that while the Philippine Legislature would like to exercise full control over the non-Christian tribes, it would be safer for all concerned if we would retain that authority until we can see how the present bill will work, which passes over to the Filipinos the senate as well as the house of representatives.

Therefore the question in my mind is, Is it better for all concerned, the Filipino as well as the non-Christian peoples, to give the control of the non-Christian tribes into the hands of the Philippine Legislature, or would it be better for us to retain the supervision over the non-Christian tribes until we see the progress in the Philippine Legislature on these matters that pass through their hands? That is the chief question that arises here. It seems to me that we are going too rapidly, and I am fearful of the effects of it.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think that one of the errors that the gentlemen on the Republican side of the House make in the consideration of this bill is the assumption that the Filipinos are not a vigorous nation or race of people capable of the very highest standards of development. You charge up to the Filipino people and hold them responsible for all of the shortcomings of the Spanish régime. Self-government was denied the Filipinos by the Spanish people, yet you charge up their failure to develop into a world-power as a liability of the Filipino people, when they were in subjection, and did not have the control or management of their own Government. We know enough to know what usually follows, and always has followed, in the wake of Spanish control. In the next place you charge up against the Filipino people all of the shortcomings of the American carpetbag government. These several and different commissions that the United States Government has had there undertaking to administer the affairs of the Philippine Islands—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HELM. Just one moment. Everywhere those commissions have fallen down, and the thing I particularly have in mind is the question of slavery that has existed there ever since the American commission took control; if it is the fault of anybody, it is just as much the fault of the American commission as the fault of anyone else, and more so because the commission went right back to the fountainhead of authority, and it ought to have and could have acquired the necessary power to suppress the evil that the gentleman has complained of.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Just for a question.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman refers to the evils of the American carpetbag government. Does the gentleman mean to state that the American government over there has been productive of evil rather than good?

Mr. HELM. I am not undertaking to say that the American administration in the Philippine Islands has been a total and abject failure. It has been in large manner a success.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman says we charged up to the Filipinos—

Mr. HELM. Yes; whatever has gone wrong. The American administration has not been responsible for anything that has gone wrong, but you contend that the Filipinos are responsible, although they did not administer the government in which they had no control, still every failure is charged up against them. The whole object and purpose of this bill is to give the Filipino people a chance to exercise government. The supreme goal in all this undertaking is Philippine independence. That is what they are contending for, and when this bill becomes a law every incentive, every motive on the part of the Filipino people will be to make good, to show their capacity not only to administer and control the affairs of the Christian tribes, but they will say, "You have given us authority to participate in the administration of the government of the people whom the American people believe are hostile to us, and we are going to show you our capacity and ability to deal successfully with that responsibility."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] made a remark a little while ago that was of considerable interest to me. It seems our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] referred to the government in the Philippine Islands as a "carpetbag government." The gentleman from Ohio seemed to resent the term, and countered by asking the gentleman from Kentucky if he meant to charge that no good thing could be done by a carpetbag government; that is, as he put it, had no good thing been done by the alien government which we have forced on the Philippine people? Mr. Chairman, I say very frankly to him that I think we have done a good many excellent things in the Philippines, but it does not get rid of the fact that it is a carpetbag government, that it is an alien government, and that it is there without the consent of the people who are being governed. The people there are hostile to it, and, in my judgment, properly hostile to it, because no carpetbag government can ever be a satisfactory one to any people. Fortunately, I was quite young during the carpetbag and reconstruction era in the South, but I remember enough of that nightmare to have had it impressed on my mind so firmly that if I lived to be a thousand years old I would never forget it. All that was possibly hateful in connection with government of our people, over whom those carpetbaggers came to rule, to tyrannize, and to persecute in a political way, was done, and the gentleman's anxiety for the recognition of literacy in government the other day was conspicuously absent at that particular time. I do not want to try to force upon any people on earth the sort of government which I would not consent to have forced upon me. There is a maxim of conduct which I commend to the attention of every man in the consideration of this matter—do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the scope and purpose of this bill is the very best thing that could be constructed for the benefit of the Filipino people. If this committee is interested with reference to these people in one thing more than another, it is in establishing that sort of relation between the American Government and the Filipino people as will give them the largest possible power to administer their own affairs. I believe that in this bill we are getting away from the bureaucratic government about which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] complains so bitterly and which was exercised under the American commission. The very fact that the administration of the government by the American commission resulted in giving the Filipino people no voice whatever is one of the sources that led us to the proposition of giving them a larger autonomy. The gentleman from Minnesota says that the appointment of two senators and nine representatives will give the Governor General autocratic power and there will be bureaucratic administration of government, which it is not our intention to give, where we are attempting to establish a representative government. That is true to a certain extent, but another thing is also true, that it is incumbent upon us as a legislative body to exercise the utmost good faith with a people for whom we are attempting to legislate. My friend from Minnesota remembers very distinctly, no doubt, that in 1905 we made a provision for a legislative assembly in the Philippines, but when we did that we absolutely retained the veto power in the Philippine Commission, and when that legislature had been elected and it was known that within 60 days it would convene for the purpose of legislating for the Filipino

people, the American commission within 10 days, before the meeting of the legislative body convened, passed 70 statutes in 10 days, covering all of the probable subjects that would be legislated upon by the Filipino—taking it out of the hands of the legislature that was elected by the people to legislate upon those subjects, and when they did legislate, made their legislation absolutely secure, so far as control was concerned, in the hands of the commission.

Of course there is no bureaucracy in that the gentleman will contend. Of course there was no bureaucracy in their taking out of the hands of the legally constituted body elected for that purpose not only the right but the power to say what kind of legislation they wanted enacted; and in the fact of that historic fact, Mr. Chairman, it ill becomes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to criticize this bill on the theory of its creating a bureaucratic form of government in the hands of the Governor General. I submit that, so far as the non-Christian people are concerned, that there is a wide difference between a legislative body that is constituted by the two senators and nine representatives and a bureau that is constituted to administer whatever the legislative body prescribes for their government. It is as separate as it is in this country, where we legislate and put in the hands of our executive officers the administration of the laws that we pass, and I take it that is the purpose that the chairman of the committee and his associates had in framing this bill and to administer for the non-Christian tribes. On the whole, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me, it is the very wisest possible thing we could do. It is not possible even to give them absolute representation without any authority over it, and so we come just as nearly as we possibly could to giving them representation in their own legislative body and create an entirely independent bureau to administer the laws that we pass for them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the terms of office of elective senators and representatives shall be four years from the 16th of October following their election. In case of vacancy among the elective members of the senate or in the house of representatives, special elections may be held in the districts wherein such vacancy occurred under such regulations as may be prescribed by law, but senators or representatives elected in such cases shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred. Senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "four," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Iowa that he recognized the gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. TOWNER. I want this amendment passed on, if the gentleman will permit. Will the gentleman permit me to do so?

Mr. QUEZON. All right.

Mr. TOWNER. I move to strike out the word "four," in line 6, and in lieu thereof insert the words "six and three years, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 13, line 6, by striking out the word "four" and inserting the words "six and three years, respectively."

Mr. TOWNER. This is in accordance with the action we have taken before.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose that will not confuse the matter. Now there is a provision that one-half of the senators elected only hold for three years—

Mr. TOWNER. That provision, the gentleman will understand, refers to the first election.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand that.

Mr. TOWNER. So there will be no confusion at all, I think.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman has thoroughly considered that and is satisfied in his own mind now about it, I am willing to accept it.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like for the gentleman himself to consider it, as well.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I have just this moment received two cablegrams from the Philippines, the contents of which ought to fill every patriotic American, regardless of his political affiliation, with joy and pride. One year ago this month a new Governor General for the Philippine Islands arrived in Manila, and was there met with a very warm and enthusiastic reception by thousands upon thousands of people,

many of whom came from the farthest corners of the archipelago. This Governor General was the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, of New York, formerly a distinguished Member of this House and now the chief executive of the Philippine Islands. [Applause.] Arches, bands of music, waving flags, and fragrant flowers spoke of the good will and the high expectations of the people of the Philippines regarding their new Governor General. What was the meaning of this magnificent and unprecedented reception given to a foreign governor. Was it, perhaps, that at last the Filipino people had forsaken their desire to be the masters of their own destinies and were actually glad to receive a foreign ruler? No; the Filipino people were then as much as they had ever been—indeed, as much as they are to-day—united in their aspiration to have as their chief executive a man of their own kind and of their own free selection. But they had heard of Gov. Gen. Harrison before; they had read some of the remarks made by him upon this floor, when he was still a Member of this House, touching upon the Philippines, and they knew thereby that Gov. Harrison had accepted the Governor Generalship of the Islands for no purpose other than that of helping the Filipino people to harvest the precious fruit of their patriotic endeavors as well as to do his part in bringing about the early redemption of the pledge of his own people to give the islands their own government. So the Filipino people looked upon the incoming Governor General from the very moment when they learned of his appointment not as their new ruler, but rather as their adviser, friend, and advocate. And so they received him with open arms and loving hearts.

The Filipino people have not been disappointed in Gov. Gen. Harrison. He has almost surpassed our expectations. During the year which has just elapsed since the day he landed on Philippine shores he has given us ample evidence that he is an able, efficient, sympathetic, and just executive and administrator; a sincere friend of our country, earnestly striving to promote its welfare and its liberty. For this reason, upon the anniversary of the governor's arrival at Manila, there was a great public demonstration, equal to if not surpassing in its display of affectionate feeling the one given him upon his arrival.

I shall read, Mr. Chairman, these cablegrams I hold in my hand, for they will tell better than I could myself of what took place in Manila. One cablegram reads:

Over 50,000 Filipinos from every walk in life and irrespective of political affiliations marched to-day to Malacanang Palace to celebrate the first anniversary of the arrival of Gov. Harrison. A delegation from the people presented the governor with an album containing a signed resolution, requesting President Wilson to keep Mr. Harrison as Governor General until the Philippine policy of the President, as outlined in his message to the Filipino people, delivered through Gov. Harrison last year, has been carried out, and conveying to Gov. Harrison the confidence and faith of the Filipino people in their governor, as well as commending his untiring and successful efforts to carry out the President's policy. Gov. Harrison addressed the gathering briefly, as follows:

"Your presence in such great numbers does me honor far beyond my deserts, but more important still you once more display the good will and confidence of the people of the Philippines toward the people of the United States. Our people are your friends, and they are proud of your progress and your accomplishments. As the representative of the United States, I desire most earnestly to merit your continued friendship and cooperation. Both these you have already shown me in unmeasured terms.

"One year ago I delivered to you a message from President Wilson. He then authorized me to say, 'We regard ourselves as trustees acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence.' To both of these principles I now reaffirm my unyielding allegiance. To both these principles I have adhered during this past year with unfaltering determination. To both I shall continue to adhere. And in this determination you have rendered me your assistance in every way. With patience, with dignity, and with wisdom you have justified the words of President Wilson toward you. The year has been one in which Filipinos may well take pride—not only the few in office but the great mass of the people as well. In the future you will tread with ever-increasing powers of self-government the same path of moderation, of justice, and of progress. Let us continue to work together united and in harmony."

Another says that a committee, composed of representative Filipinos from every walk in life and of delegations from all the most important social associations in the Philippines, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the benefits of good laws and liberal constitution are only shared by the people through the faithful execution of these laws and the mandates of said constitution by executives jealous of the strict compliance of their duties: and

Whereas the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, Governor General of the Philippine Islands, ever since his assumption of office has faithfully interpreted and executed not only the laws and the constitution of the Philippine Islands but also the policy of the President of the United States, as outlined in his message to the Filipino people and conveyed to them by said Gov. Gen. Harrison, so much so that he has brought to the public mind the conviction that there now exists in these islands a government that protects life and liberty and promotes prosperity alike to the natives and to the foreigners, the undersigned representing the people of Manila and neighboring Provinces—

Resolved, First, that a visit be paid to said Governor General, the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, at Malacanang Palace at 4 p. m. on the 11th

day of October, in order to give him a public and official testimony of the great satisfaction that the people of the Philippine Islands feel for his upright and wise administration.

Second. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Assembly.

Third. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Resident Commissioners in the United States, with the request that they communicate the same to the Congress and to the President of the United States and state at the same time the ardent desire of the people of the Philippines that said Hon. Francis Burton Harrison remain as chief executive of these islands.

Fourth. That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Governor General, Francis Burton Harrison, written in an album and signed by the executive committee and other representative persons who may wish to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it is only natural that the Filipino people should thus feel toward their present Governor General. They owe it to him, since he has under the most difficult circumstances succeeded in giving them an efficient and very satisfactory government. The first anniversary of Mr. Harrison's administration shows a reduction in the expenses of the Philippine Government, as compared with the last six months of the preceding calendar year, of \$2,000,000 per annum, out of a total expenditure which had been in the past slightly less than \$15,000,000 per annum. Nearly one-half of this great saving had been effected in the expenses of bureaus and offices, and represented real economy in that it showed a reduction in the "overhead" cost of administering the affairs of the islands.

A portion of the governor's first message to the Philippine Legislature was devoted to a description of the financial difficulties which the insular government was facing upon his arrival. The saving effected, as I have already indicated, shows how great an effort and how much courage and determination were necessary to accomplish this great reduction in the expenses of the government. I shall not detain the House by reading this message, but the American people should be acquainted with it, and therefore I shall insert it in this part of my remarks. The message referred to is as follows:

ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Gentlemen of the legislature, for the first time since the occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States a Democratic administration assumed control of the United States Government upon the 4th of last March. Ten days ago, as the representative of that administration, I came to you as your chief executive bearing a message from President Woodrow Wilson. That message, indicating the policy of the President in respect to these islands, I have already delivered to the Philippine people in his name.

The President has promised that he will give immediately to the people of the Philippines, as the first step toward carrying out his policy, a majority of the appointive commission. This legislature will, therefore, for the first time have a majority of native citizens in both branches. In consequence the eyes of the American people will be upon this legislature with a confident expectation that it will furnish to the world a proof that you are capable of self-government and that it will measurably advance the day of independence.

You begin your labors at a time of profound peace throughout the islands. It is our duty to conserve it.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS.

Every legitimate business enterprise should and will receive the protection of the Insular Government. But we must bear in mind that business is intended to serve the Government, not the Government to serve business. The duty of government is to see that every business man receives an equal opportunity before the law, not that any business man should enjoy a special privilege.

The best service that a government can properly render to commercial enterprise is to restore confidence and to promote good feeling. If the new administration here shall be the instrument of bringing about a better understanding between the different elements of the community, it will be promoting the best interests of the business world. Good feeling between all classes of residents in the islands is the best asset of a business community. It should be our duty and it will be my constant preoccupation to leave nothing untended to bring about this happy result.

Before proceeding to a discussion of any other matter, I submit for your consideration a report recently made by the former secretary of the Interior of this Government upon the subject of slavery.

DEFICIT DEMANDS ECONOMY.

My term of service in this Government has been short. I am not at this moment prepared to advise with you upon all subjects of public interest. At a future day I shall ask your indulgence to send to you other messages upon matters of public moment. For the present I direct your attention to one special subject in my judgment of paramount importance.

The most pressing need of the hour is economy in the public expenditures. This matter, in my opinion, is the most important question now affecting the success and welfare of this Government. Based upon the estimates of probable receipts and expenditures for the current fiscal year, as published by the auditor, it is probable that the Government, without the adoption of a drastic program of economy is face to face with a deficit of about four and a half million pesos.

From June 30, 1908, when the surplus in the Insular treasury was \$17,499,894.97, the surplus has fallen as of June 30, 1913, to \$14,230,220.23. Of this sum, however, about \$5,000,000 is only nominally available, it being invested in supplies and having been carried to the surplus account in 1911, thus leaving an actual cash surplus in hand at the conclusion of the last fiscal year of only about \$9,000,000.

This shrinkage in the available surplus of the Government has come about notwithstanding the fact that during this period of four years the sum of \$6,000,000 has been obtained by the sale of an issue of public works bonds, and expended out of the treasury, and notwithstanding the further fact that a little less than three and a half million pesos from the gold standard fund has during this period passed through the treasury in the same way.

At the present rate the auditor on June 30, 1913, estimated that the current expenditures of this Government would exceed the income by about \$2,000,000 in the course of the fiscal year. In this connection it

is fair to say that the insular collector of customs, in making his estimate to the auditor, properly discounted the fact that owing to the limited importation of rice the custom revenues would fall, and they actually have fallen in the first two months about \$1,600,000. It is also fair to state that the estimates made at the same time by the collector of internal revenue were probably exaggerated when he predicted an increase of about \$1,000,000 in internal revenue; in any event it is certain that this expected increase has not only failed to materialize thus far, but that we are actually running behind the internal-revenue receipts of the preceding fiscal year in a sum which for the first three months has exceeded \$100,000. This decrease may possibly be offset by the collection of the new income tax.

While it is possible that the income from customs may improve somewhat from the present date, approximately \$3,000,000 may be figured as the probable deficit based upon the ordinary income and expenditure of the government for the present year. To this we must add the sum of \$1,500,000 of which the treasury is to be deprived in the balance of the current year by the passage of the Underwood tariff bill, which removes the tax upon exports.

COMMENTS UNDERWOOD BILL.

Too much can not be said in commendation of the Underwood tariff bill in its relation to the Philippine Islands. Not only does this act remove the limitations imposed by the Payne law upon the amount of sugar, tobacco, and rice which may be exported free to the United States, but in removing the export tax upon such commodities as hemp, copra, and sugar a heavy burden of taxation is lifted from the shoulders of the farmers of the Philippine Islands, and an immediate increase in their prosperity is confidently expected as a result of this measure.

Our treasury is therefore obviously approaching a point where a deficit of \$4,500,000 confronts us. How, then, shall we avoid this deficit and restore the finances of our government to a normal and self-supporting condition? In my judgment but one course is open to us. I can not offer to you the possibility of an issue of public bonds to recoup the treasury. However much justification might be found in the eyes of some for a bond issue for some work of great public importance, no argument can support, under any system of government, a bond issue to meet current expenses. Indeed, a bond issue to recoup a falling treasury is tantamount to a confession of bankruptcy. Even if we could hope to secure congressional action upon an application for such an issue of bonds we would be condemned in the eyes of other nations for a failure to manage our affairs here upon a sound and conservative basis.

I repeat, then, only one course lies before us, and that is economy of the most drastic kind. In considering the question of economy I urge upon the members of the legislature that they approach this subject in a spirit of cooperation and self-sacrifice. It may be that for the time being partial cessation of some of the public works will be required, and this may bring temporary disappointment to certain localities in the islands, but it is my earnest hope and intention that as soon as the treasury can be restored to a sound basis, the public works shall go forward uninterrupted and with renewed zeal.

A considerable burden is also laid upon the treasury by the large proportion of American employees in this Government. While the enunciated policy has been to reduce this number as rapidly as possible consistent with the demands of fairness and efficiency, the last annual report of the bureau of civil service shows that there were more Americans having a permanent status in the Philippine civil service in 1912 than in any previous year since 1905. At the present time no further civil-service employees should be brought here from the United States to fill purely clerical positions, nor in any event except where special requirements may make such course necessary.

TOP-HEAVY BUREAUCRACY.

These islands have need of a simple and scientific form of government. Instead of that, we find a complicated and top-heavy system of bureaucracy. Much can be done toward simplifying this bureau form of government, and in this connection I invite your consideration to the possibility of a reduction in the number of the bureaus by consolidation or otherwise. It has also been suggested that some of the salaries of the higher Government officials are disproportionate to the size of the insular revenues. When you proceed to a discussion of this question, I strongly recommend to you that no change be in any event effected in the judicial salaries, nor in the salaries of employees who are receiving \$5,000 or less. We find, moreover, that as an incident to highly centralized bureaucratic government a number of offices have been created and salaries have been raised without, what seems to me to have been, due authority of law; and as further inevitable result of bureaucracy, here as elsewhere, too many offices now exist. You are invited to scrutinize the bureaus of this Government with an eye to economy in that respect.

A further and perhaps considerable saving might be effected by a change in our method of appropriations; good usage elsewhere commands to us a system of direct treasury appropriations.

In this connection it is my hope that previous differences of opinion between the two houses may now be removed. This legislature, which meets to-day, should proceed to its work with a determination that the two houses will act in harmony, and that the necessary supply bills of the Government may become law by the joint will of the legislature instead of through the individual fiat of the executive.

ON TRIAL.

The present financial condition of this treasury calls for action of the highest order of self-denial and patriotism on the part of this legislature. The President has promised you a majority in the upper house, so that you may have control of both branches of your legislature. In doing this he placed upon you the responsibility to show to the whole world your capacity to legislate. Here at the outset a severe trial is upon you. I call upon each member of this legislature to do his share in the work which I have outlined. I do this assured that in this first and perhaps most severe test to which your honorable body will be subjected you will prove entirely worthy of the confidence placed in you by the President of the United States.

Great and commendable as is the work done by Gov. Gen. Harrison in the direction I have described, it is not all nor is it the most important of his achievements within a very short period of time. When he came to the islands the Filipino people were beginning to doubt their insular administrators. Ever since the beginning of the American administration, and in accord with the celebrated instructions of President McKinley, Governors General have been promising to place Filipinos in

the appointive positions of that government as soon and as fast as they could show themselves capable of filling those positions. Yet in his report for 1909 Gov. Gen. Forbes, speaking of the bureau of civil service, said that the progress made in increasing the proportion of Filipino employees was not satisfactory. Gov. Gen. Harrison found that in 1912, as shown in the report of the bureau of civil service for that year, there were more Americans having a permanent status in the Philippine service than in any previous year since 1905. Gov. Gen. Harrison came forward with the fearless purpose of redeeming the pledges of his predecessors as much as with that of carrying out the policies of the President and making his own desires effective. He therefore began to appoint Filipinos to responsible positions, and his early action on this score at once revived the declining faith of the people of the Philippine Islands in the protestations of the previous Governors General. Both the policies of economy and that of doing justice to the Filipino people provoked a storm of criticism on the part of the necessary victims of such a policy, and Gov. Gen. Harrison was accused of disorganizing the Philippine Government, of disregarding the civil-service rules, and of using the methods of the ward politician. An article purporting to be an interview with Gov. Gen. Harrison saw the light in a Honolulu newspaper. This was quoted and re-quoted and several times reprinted to show that Gov. Gen. Harrison was an ordinary politician, to be ranked with those who believe in and practice the spoils system in its most extreme form. One of the most notorious occasions on which use was made of this supposed interview was the citation of it by ex-Secretary Dean C. Worcester, formerly of the Philippine Government, in his book entitled "The Philippines—Past and Present," published after the Philippine Islands had been relieved of his authority. On page 377 of his book I quote the following:

While in Honolulu, en route to Manila, Mr. Harrison gave out an interview, which I am credibly informed he has since confirmed in substance. It contained the following statements:

"For years I have been of the minority in Congress, and have seen the Democrats kicked about, trampled upon, and otherwise manhandled by Republicans, so that I must confess it now gives me a saturnine pleasure to see the Democrats in a position to do the same thing to the Republicans."

His early official acts after arrival at Manila confirmed the belief that this was indeed the spirit in which he was facing the great responsibility which there confronted him.

It is beyond doubt or cavil that high ideals heretofore have prevailed in the Philippine civil service. Are they now to be substituted by the methods of the ward politician?

I do not know who was this credible informant of Mr. Worcester. But ever since he began his attack upon Gov. Gen. Harrison he has been disseminating so much of the same "credible information" which proved afterwards to be absolutely unreliable that it makes no difference who this particular informant is. I received a cablegram some time ago from Gov. Gen. Harrison in answer to one of inquiry from me positively denying that he had ever made such statements. I did not need to ask him, and I hope the Governor knew that I did not cable him for that purpose, in order to assure myself that he did not grant such an interview. I have the honor of knowing personally the motives that inspired Gov. Gen. Harrison in accepting the Governor Generalship of the Philippine Islands. I saw what he did following his assumption of office, and I was therefore fully aware that the alleged interview was a falsehood—the mere invention of an unscrupulous reporter. But I sent this cablegram to the Governor in order to be able to say that he positively and directly repudiated the interview.

The truth is that the methods of Gov. Gen. Harrison in matters of appointment are absolutely free not only from any justified charge but even from any appearance of justification that he has employed the methods of—in the words of Mr. Worcester—"a ward politician." Gov. Gen. Harrison has not given positions in the Philippine Government to personal friends. He has not brought with him relatives to do business in the islands or to engage in agriculture on lands rented or purchased from the Philippine Government, and this dignified conduct of the Governor is the more praiseworthy since he is the first Governor General of the islands, who was previously a Member of Congress, and had therefore many political friends, a circumstance which doubtless has on more than one occasion put to a test his integrity of character and devotion to duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The all-embracing activity of our Governor General made it possible for him not only to reduce the expenses of the Philippine Government, not only to relieve that government of unnecessary officials, not only to give to the Filipinos such posts as they should immediately have, but also to dispose of every question that required immediate attention and to inaugurate a successful system of government for the non-Christian tribes,

which before his attempt had been looked to as sure to produce dreadful effects. Gov. Gen. Harrison has practically solved the so-called Moro problem. The Filipinos professing the Mohammedan religion and inhabiting the islands of Jolo and western and central parts of Mindanao have given continuous trouble to the American Government. They were never actually under the control of Spain, and it had been stated that said Filipinos who are called Moros could be governed only by a strong military force that must be composed primarily of Americans. There were suggestions that, in the words of an old saying, somewhat adapted, "The only good Moro is the dead Moro." At all events, it was most emphatically asserted that they could not be governed by a civil governor. In consultation with the Army commanders of the Philippines and of the War Department, Gov. Gen. Harrison substituted a civil for the military government of the Moro Province before he was two months in Manila, and to-day a new law has already been enacted that has reorganized the government of that country, with the result that there is to-day complete tranquillity and peace among these supposedly indomitable people; with the further result that there are more schools and better sanitation among them, and with the crowning result that twice as much land was under the plow on March 31, 1914, as there was when Gov. Carpenter, of the Moro Province, was inaugurated in November or December of last year. The other non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines have also been properly dealt with. It was the old policy to isolate them from the Christian Filipinos. There were indications that this was done with no very sane purpose. At any rate, it was a most unreasonable plan, sure to accomplish, whether so meant or not, the development in the Philippines of a people within another people, differing in ideas and customs with, if not antagonistic to, the latter. It retarded the development of the former by depriving them of intercommunication with their more advanced and civilized brethren. Gov. Gen. Harrison, in consultation and in accord with the able and industrious secretary of the interior, Hon. Winfred T. Denison, has reversed that policy and has inaugurated a new one, by which contact between the Christians and non-Christians is brought about and a more intimate relation is created, while more attention is given to their education and to their health. The secretary of the interior, in his instructions to his delegate for the government of the non-Christians, said:

You shall endeavor to make yourself in good truth the unifier, tearing down as rapidly as possible the walls which have isolated the non-Christians from the Christians.

Gov. Gen. Harrison has not only merited the love of the Filipinos themselves, but the applause of his superiors—the Secretary of War and the President. Upon the passage of the first appropriation bill enacted by the Philippine Legislature, in accord with the suggestion of the Governor General in his message, to which I have before referred, the President sent him a cablegram expressing his appreciation for his successful administration, and the Secretary of War sent him the following message:

I congratulate you upon the passage for the first time in three years of a general appropriation bill and on the fact that the bill was passed unanimously by both houses. I have no doubt but that there were, as to a great many features, differences of opinion, but it is a source of satisfaction to the department that such differences were satisfactorily adjusted. Please extend to both houses of the Philippine Legislature my congratulations on this event and express to them my hope that this is but an indication of what may be expected in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I shall no longer detain the House with this topic, though I am sure, from the close attention with which the committee has heard me, that the Members are glad to hear of the wonderful accomplishments of a dear friend and once their colleague. I want to say only one other word, and I mean it for every American interested in the Philippine Islands. The Filipinos owe to Gov. Gen. Harrison a debt of gratitude that they can never pay. He has served as faithfully as the most intelligent and patriotic of their own people or of their own selection could have done. He has served disinterestedly, devotedly, and untiringly. May God grant that he remain at the head of our government, representing this great Nation there, until the day shall have arrived when the Filipino people may elect his successor. But Gov. Gen. Harrison has not only served, not even mainly served, the people of the Philippine Islands; he has also served his own people, the people of the United States. He has served them both in a practical way and in furthering their ideals of government. He has served them in a practical way because the policies of Gov. Gen. Harrison, his gentleness and justness in dealing with the Filipino people, have made the Filipinos better friends of the Americans. To-day the American employee, the American business man, is better liked and better helped by the Filipinos. He has served them in furthering the ideals of this Government, as the Governor General himself stated it in

his speech at the banquet of welcome tendered him the night of his arrival in Manila. These are his own words:

Standing here before this flag, to which I, in common with you, owe allegiance, and of which I am proud, I pledge to you that the best service that I can render to my country is to render service to the best aspirations of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I entertain the hope that the day will sometime arrive when the arrival of Gov. Gen. Harrison in the Philippines will be celebrated as one of our national holidays. [Applause.]

In connection with my remarks, I wish to print the following interview given by the Secretary of War, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor, and also a short quotation from a very responsible newspaper in the United States, that may give the keynote to the attacks made upon Gov. Gen. Harrison:

Mr. Secretary, you were quoted the other day as saying that a good many misstatements were being printed about the situation in the Philippines, and that you would like the people to get information that is accurate and truthfully reveals conditions. I would like very much to have certain points cleared up.

Answer. I will be very pleased to give you any information you want about the Philippines.

Question. Has the criticism of the Harrison administration been unusually severe?

Answer. If you will look back through your files and that of other leading newspapers, you will find that it has not been, compared to the criticism which has met every change of the past in the islands. Every change or step taken by the American Government has been met with a great deal of criticism and much loose talk, and you will find that most of such statements were untrue and much of the criticism and condemnation without foundation in fact.

Question. This is interesting, Mr. Secretary, in view of the impression sought to be created that in the past all was fair sailing in the Philippines, and no breeze of adverse criticism had rippled the seas. May I ask what were the subjects of adverse criticism?

Answer. You will recall the bitter criticisms of the conduct of our Army in suppressing insurrection; the criticism that civil government was established too soon, while the "iron hand" was still necessary to enduring peace; that the civil government was extravagant and incompetent; that it favored a policy of exploitation ruinous to the natives and in the interest of a few Americans. These are but a few of the subjects which one recalls without the need of investigation and without looking up the records.

Question. I am told that the present criticisms are entitled to greater weight because of the fact that in the past the criticisms had their origin in America, while the present criticisms are an echo of the American press in the islands and are based on statements of persons fresh from the islands. Is that so?

Answer. It is true that the American press criticisms are but echoes of the American press in the islands and a repetition of statements made by those returning from the islands. It is not true that this was otherwise in the past.

The attack on Mr. Taft following his formulation of the motto: "The Philippines for the Filipinos," was most bitter in the American press of Manila. Mr. Taft was represented by that press to be the most unpopular American in the islands.

His reply to this criticism in his speech before the Union Reading College, Manila, P. I., on December 17, 1903, has given the record of this feeling at that time a permanent place in the history of the government of the islands. The speech would serve, with few changes, to reply to present critics, including Mr. Taft, Mr. Worcester, and others. The basis of present criticisms is identical and the source is the same.

Later, the criticisms of Gov. Forbes were quite as bitter in the Philippine-American press as in the United States, the only difference between the cases of Gov. Forbes and Mr. Taft being that the press differed in the Forbes controversy, while it was unanimous in abusing Mr. Taft.

Question. What do you think produces this spirit of attack, and why should this be so?

Answer. Well, for one reason, of course, any who have been displaced always make a lot of noise and get their friends interested in condemning those in authority. Furthermore, there is a unique situation out there in this: There are Americans in business there, and when changes are made in the heads of the Government they, of course, desire to establish some form of intimate relations; and very often when they find that they are not being consulted either as frequently or as intimately as they think they should be, they retaliate by unfounded condemnation and general damning of the new officials. Or where, as on one occasion in the past, there has been a feeling that the Governor General was too friendly with one section of the American public, the criticism was even greater.

Question. Has there been any unusual dismissals of American employees under the Harrison administration?

Answer. No; the number of dismissals has not been unusual. It has increased slightly, due to necessary retrenchment. The number, however, is not one-half of what it was in years like 1903 and 1904, nor so great as it was in 1905 and 1906, when there was an effort at retrenchment.

Question. What is there in the charge that the civil-service rules have been disregarded? How many Americans, all told, has Gov. Harrison taken out to the Philippines and put into positions there?

Answer. Not a single instance has been brought to my attention where it was charged that Gov. Harrison had disregarded civil-service rules. Fewer Americans have been taken to the islands during Gov. Gen. Harrison's administration than during any similar period in recent years.

Of Americans coming from the United States since his arrival he has appointed the collector of customs, one member of the municipal board of the city of Manila, and one member of the public utilities commission.

Question. What are the important positions to which the Governor General might, if he so desired, appoint his American political friends?

Answer. First, the chiefs of bureaus of the Government, of which there are about 22. Second, the judges of first instance in the islands, of which there are 38. All of these judicial positions have been filled by appointment since Gov. Harrison arrived in the islands. Third, miscellaneous appointments, such as the members of the municipal board of

the city of Manila, governor of the department of Mindanao and Sulu, and members of the public utilities commission.

Question. Now, Mr. Secretary, in how many of these has the Governor actually appointed Americans brought by him from the United States?

Answer. Of the heads of the bureaus of the Philippine Government Gov. Harrison appointed one—the collector of customs—from the United States—Dr. Herstein. Dr. Herstein had been an employee of the United States civil service for some years. He was a tariff expert employed in the framing of the recent United States tariff. His politics are not known to me.

He appointed, as a member of the municipal board of the city of Manila, Dr. Fitzsimmons, who had served in the islands formerly.

He appointed, as a member of the public utilities commission, Stephen Bonsal, a well-known American newspaper and literary man.

He reappointed every judge of first instance on the bench, and in filling the remaining vacancies he selected two Americans, one of whom had been long in the service of the islands and one who had been in the islands only a short time in the civil service, but had previously been in the civil service of the United States.

Question. What basis is there for the statement that business is disorganized in the islands and that the economic conditions are upset?

Answer. About as much basis as there is for such a statement with reference to the United States. It is perfectly well known to anyone who is searching for the truth that there has been a world-wide business depression, and that while in particular communities this depression may have been enhanced or mitigated by local conditions, this has only been in the matter of degree. In the Philippines, due to the exclusively agricultural basis of business, this depression has been least. Unquestionably, some business men wished to know the course that this administration proposed to pursue before they embarked in any extension of their business enterprises. But to suggest seriously that there has been any panicky condition produced in the Philippines by anything that this Government has done or left undone is simply to state that which has not the basis of truth.

Question. But it has been said that there has been an immense falling in the imports into the islands, showing a lack of confidence in business conditions?

Answer. That the imports into the Philippines are, when analyzed, an indication of business conditions and confidence, or the lack thereof, is to an extent true.

However, one of the imports which varies most from year to year is rice. The importation of rice in large quantities is an indication of the failure of the local rice crop and, contrary to the general rule, its importation in large quantities is an indication rather of local distress than of a healthy condition.

The fiscal year 1912, i. e., the year ending June 30, 1912, was, measured by the total of imports, the most prosperous year up to that time in the history of the Philippines. The total imports were \$54,549,980. But the dark spot was that of this total \$10,519,949 was rice, the result of an unusually disastrous failure of the Philippine rice crop.

In the fiscal year 1913 the total imports showed an increase over the preceding year to \$56,327,583, though the imports of rice were but \$7,940,857.

The reports of Philippine commerce have now been received to include the month of May, 1914. I give the following from the records for purposes of comparison:

Total imports for 11 months ending May, 1912.....	\$48,522,580
Total imports for 11 months ending May, 1913.....	51,543,134
Total for 11 months ending May, 1914.....	50,876,025

For the same periods, omitting rice:

1912.....	\$39,731,895
1913.....	43,825,329
1914.....	48,395,180

Of the total during these three periods there were from the United States:

1912.....	\$18,560,805
1913.....	23,130,695
1914.....	25,752,233

In the face of this it is idle to talk of depression or lack of confidence.

Question. As a matter of fact, has the administration taken any radical step of any kind in the Philippines; and if so, what; and what effect do you think this has had?

Answer. As a matter of fact, the administration has not only taken no radical step, but has not done anything except in good faith pursue the policy which has been announced to the Filipinos from the very beginning. All of the American Governors have promised them to put them into governmental positions just as soon as they were capable of performing the duties; that is, to bring about the so-called Filipinization of the service. You will find references and promises of this character in the reports and public utterances of every Governor General.

President Taft, when chairman of the Philippine Commission, and afterwards when Civil Governor, inaugurated this treatment of the Filipinos pursuant to specific instructions of President McKinley. In doing this he met with just the same storm of abuse which is now revived against Harrison. I have just recently seen a speech made by him in which he alludes at great length to this matter in vindication of his position. Referring to the invitation to make the address, Mr. Taft then said:

"The civil government was just then receiving even more criticism than usual from the young lions of the Manila press."

Later he says:

"Some of our young lions of the local press have spoken of the 'childish slogan: The Philippines for the Filipinos.' It is unnecessary to comment on the adjective used, but it is sufficient to say that, whether childish or not, the principle makes up the web and the woof of the policy of the United States with respect to those islands, as it has been authoritatively declared by two Presidents of the United States—for President Roosevelt has followed sedulously the policy of President McKinley—and by the interpretation of the supreme popular will, the Congress of the United States."

And again:

"There are many Americans in these islands, possibly a majority—and this includes all the American press—who are strongly opposed to the doctrine of 'the Philippines for the Filipinos.' They have no patience with the policy of attraction, no patience with attempts to conciliate the Filipino people, no patience with the introduction into the government as rapidly as their fitness justifies of the prominent Filipinos. They resent everything in the government that is not

American. They insist that there is a necessity for a firm government here rather than a popular one, and that the welfare of Americans and American trade should be regarded as paramount."

And with reference to the then attitude of the American press and merchants of the city of Manila, he said:

"The attitude of the American press and of the American merchant in his hostility to the Filipino, and in the consequent hostility to the civil government, was led into the error at one time of emphasizing in every possible way, by letters and representations of all sorts, that the condition of the country as to tranquillity was so bad that the whole of the islands was still in a state of war. Every small ladrone fight, every discomfiture which the constabulary suffered, was exaggerated and made the basis for inference that the conditions in the country were retrograding rather than improving. Such incidents were seized upon and made as much of as headlines and general statements could make them."

And with reference to its attitude toward the Filipino, he said:

"When one's feelings of enmity are very much aroused it is difficult to set the limit to the expression of them. So it is that we have the young lions of the American press, of the three newspapers who are supposed to speak the American public opinion in these islands, holding the Filipino up to contempt, exposing all his supposed vices, and giving him no credit whatever for any virtues, and it may be that this represents the feeling of the majority of the resident Americans in Manila. But can we not, in the end, be just and give to the whole Filipino people their due? Should we wish the Filipino people to judge of Americans by the drunken, truculent American loafers who infest the small towns of these islands, living on the fruits of the labor of Filipino women, and give us more trouble than any other element in the islands? Should we wish the Filipino people to judge American standards of honesty by reading the humiliating list of American official and unofficial defaulters in these islands? I think not."

After reviewing the reiterated promises of the American Government in the islands and of the Presidents of the United States to look solely to the welfare of the Philippine Islands, Mr. Taft said again:

"Again, one of the conditions indispensable to progress is tranquillity. Without it capital, constitutionally timid, will not come. Now what has produced the present tranquillity? I say without hesitation that the chief element to-day is the confidence which the conservative people of the islands have in the promise of the United States to make the welfare of the Filipinos its chief purpose in remaining here and to assist them sincerely in learning the secret of self-government by gradually enlarging their political power."

And then:

"How long is it thought we could avail ourselves of this popular support if we repudiated our national promises and adopted the policy of repulsion and repression, dignified under the name 'the policy of a firm hand,' and if we said to the people, 'You are not to be trusted; the offices must all go to Americans; you are an inferior race and are sufficiently rewarded by having a superior race to come here and run your government for you?'"

And, finally, with reference to the policy of the American Government, he said:

"What do the young lions of the American press in Manila, what do the merchants of Manila who take the position I have attempted to explain and describe, expect to do? Do they expect to change the policy of the Government? Certainly not, as long as the Government of the United States is alive to the honor of preserving sacred its promises to a whole people. From where do they expect the political support that can be effective to carry out the policy which their attitude indicates? The policy of the present civil government in placing as its first aim the promotion of the welfare and the prosperity of the Filipino people and the gradual extension to them of self-government is the identical policy of the Republican Party as shown in its platform of 1900."

Question. To what do you attribute this apparent purpose of misleading the American public about the real situation?

Answer. Very largely to those who were fearful of some radical action on the part of the administration, which they thought would be disastrous to their own interests and to those who, not swayed by self-interest, feared that such action would be detrimental to the best interests of the islands and this country. That is to say, the fear that, without sufficient investigation and without careful consideration, this administration would cut all bonds between this country and the Philippine Islands and leave them to start as a national entity without any further guidance and control. If they had taken counsel of facts and not of their fears, they would not have started upon any such campaign. I do not think I am mistaken in believing that those who were the leaders in this clamor against Gov. Harrison would now, in view of all the facts, gladly destroy the record which they have made for themselves. Unfortunately many who have accepted these statements as facts have not the same means of ascertaining the truth, and now accept as facts what these leaders proclaimed from their fears and now have not the courage to deny.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what has been the policy of this administration toward the Philippines?

Answer. President Wilson plainly marked out our attitude toward the Philippines upon two occasions: First, when he authorized Gov. Harrison in his inaugural address to make the following statement:

"We regard ourselves as trustees, acting not for the advantage of the United States, but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for their independence; and we hope to move toward that end as rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the islands will permit. After each step taken experience will guide us to the next. The administration will take one step at once. It will give to the native citizens of the islands a majority in the appointive commission, and thus in the upper as well as in the lower house of the legislature. It will do this in the confident hope and expectation that immediate proof will thereby be given in the action of the commission under the new arrangement of the political capacity of those native citizens who have already come forward to represent and lead their people in affairs."

Second, in his next annual message to Congress, in which he said as follows:

"No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice and interest and affection, but the performance of our duty toward the Philippines is a more difficult and debatable matter. We can satisfy the obligations of generous justice toward the people of Porto Rico by giving them the ample and familiar rights and privileges accorded our own citizens in our own Territories and our obligations toward the people of Hawaii by perfecting the provisions for self-government already granted them,

but in the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid.

"Acting under the authority conferred upon the President by Congress, I have already accorded the people of the islands a majority in both houses of their legislative body by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission. I believe that in this way we shall make proof of their capacity in counsel and their sense of responsibility in the exercise of political power, and that the success of this step will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow. Step by step we should extend and perfect the system of self-government in the islands, making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their successes and their failures; that we should more and more put under the control of the native citizens of the archipelago the essential instruments of their life, their local instrumentalities of government, their schools, all the common interests of their communities, and so by counsel and experience set up a government which all the world will see to be suitable to a people whose affairs are under their own control. At last, I hope and believe, we are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and competent tread upon it, and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it.

Since it is the conceded fact that from the very beginning the American people, speaking through their representatives, have always disclaimed any intention to incorporate the Philippines as part of the American body politic, and since it has always been treated as only a question of time when they should have some form of national autonomy, the real matter to be considered by statesmen and by citizens who wish to do what is right is how to proceed in the matter so as to reach a just conclusion. This administration has proceeded along the line of experience, which, as the old adage tells us, is the best school; I think I would say practically the only useful school. The experiment which we made initially, as outlined in the quoted declaration of the President, has not only not proven unwise, but has proven very wise.

The next step to be taken, as provided in the pending Jones bill, is to give them further autonomous power; that is, to give them more participation in managing their own affairs, with, however, such reservations of guidance and control to the Federal Government as to enable it to see that no harm comes.

Question. What, in your judgment, will likely be the effect of this measure, if enacted into law, upon the Filipinos?

Answer. I can not see how it can be other than very favorable. The Filipinos who have sufficient knowledge and ability to deal with the subject realize that until they demonstrate their ability to operate successfully a government in all of its manifold and complex aspects it would be unthinkable that the United States would be justified in withdrawing from its position of trusteeship. The only way in which they can demonstrate their capacity is after trial. Any body of citizenship which has not been accustomed to exercising governmental functions must become accustomed thereto before it can successfully do so. It is known historically that the Philippine people for centuries have not been governing themselves. It is not to be wondered at that they can not immediately evoke the public opinion which is necessary to all successful self-governments. The coherent and cohesive aggregation of public opinion is the result of training; and those who have the best interests of the Filipinos at heart, both natives and those of our country, realize that they must be given the opportunity to cultivate and cause to grow up the necessary patriotic cooperation before they can have a successful self-controlled government. What we have in view is to make the conditions favorable for the growth of that sort of patriotic cooperation, the linking together of these nationals, with a view of eventually finding in that country such a condition as makes likely the success of self-government.

We have done that which we think was wise and conservative and thoughtful to take the next step in laying the groundwork for this hoped-for eventual condition.

[From the St. Louis Mirror, December 12, 1913.]

Gov. Gen. Harrison is evidently trying to find out things from Filipinos, not from bureaucrats who have been living on the people. This is in line with the policy of giving Filipinos a majority in the important offices. The job holders don't like it. They can't bear to see the Governor General mixing up with the natives, who may tell him things about the secret government by concessionaires. Mr. Harrison has an idea, evidently, that government of the Philippines must be for the Filipinos and not exclusively for Yankee job holders and promoters. How extraordinary! No wonder Mr. Harrison has the disloyalty of the old-timers—better say "the old gang." They don't like this demonstration of the meaning of the New Freedom, which is also the old freedom.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of line 5, page 13, the word "elective," and in line 14 the last sentence, as follows:

Senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 13, by striking out in line 5 the word "elective," and in line 14, after the word "occurred," strike out the words "senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the term of the appointive senators and representatives who are to represent the non-Christian territory coterminous with the elective senators and representatives, and also to take away from the power of the Governor General a club that he might hold over his appointees to remove them at any time that he saw fit in case they would not reflect his opinion in their votes in either the senate or house of representatives.

I think it is abhorrent to our sense of representative government that even these appointees of the Governor General, the

two senators and nine representatives, who will represent the non-Christian territory, should hold office at the mere beck and call of the Governor General to do his bidding in this assembly. We have adopted the policy in the previous section of having these representatives who look after the interests of these non-Christian territories appointed by the Governor General; but when once they are appointed they should be privileged to serve throughout the extent of their terms and should not be subject to removal without cause by the Governor General. I see the distinguished gentleman, the Commissioner from the Philippines, nodding his head as if in affirmance and as giving assent to this proposition. I hope he does reflect the ideas I am speaking for, because I can not imagine that these men should be subject to removal by the Governor General without any cause whatsoever.

If we take away this power, the Governor General, I assume, will in the first instance exercise rare judgment in the selection of the persons who are to represent these non-Christian people, and if perchance they should act at variance with his opinion it is not saying they should not continue in that representative capacity. They are not appointed to these legislative bodies as his personal representatives; they are appointed there to carry out what they believe to be for the best interests of the non-Christian people. If you are going to leave them subject to removal by the Governor General, instead of appointing two senators and nine representatives you might just as well—if you do not wish to give opportunity for the appointment of mere playthings in politics, mere automatons, to indicate the will of the Governor General—have one in the senate and one in the house who will always be regarded as the spokesman and rubber stamp of the Governor General.

I think this amendment should be adopted and accepted by the committee in carrying out that idea by giving the greatest representative government that is compatible with existing conditions in the islands to the Filipinos. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to oppose this amendment. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the Governor General himself has no fixed term. The President of the United States can remove him at any time, and the same is true of the members of the Philippine Commission. The President to-day can remove all nine of them. It is also—

Mr. STAFFORD. Subject, however, to confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Subject to confirmation by the Senate, of course. That is, the appointment of their successors is subject to approval by the Senate, but the Senate has nothing to do with the removal of the Governor General and the other members. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that shortly before the end of the last administration one of the Philippine Commission, a distinguished citizen, a Republican, and a man who had been a member of the supreme court of one of our States, was removed summarily by the President of the United States because he did not agree with another member of the commission. He had been to the United States on a vacation. He had started back to the Philippine Islands and had gotten as far as Europe on his way when he was cabled to return to the United States. It seems that in the meantime Mr. Forbes had been here, had had a talk with the President, the result of which was his dismissal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was in an administrative capacity, and—

Mr. JONES. I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. And of course there had to be harmony of action where they were administering the affairs of the Philippines. This is a legislative capacity entirely.

Mr. JONES. Yes; and if the Governor General of the Philippines were to remove one of these representatives because he did not carry out his will, the President of the United States, if he did what was right, would immediately cut off the official head of the Governor General. That would be the action of the President.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose, then, that these representatives in the respective chambers are to be the reflex action or the representatives of the Governor General rather than representatives of these non-Christian people?

Mr. JONES. No. It is believed they will be the representatives of the non-Christian people, but, as I have said over and over during the course of this debate, the committee knows of no better way of selecting them than leaving it to the Governor General. These uncivilized people are not capable of selecting their own representatives, and the gentleman himself, I think,

would not, if he would reflect for a moment, like to see a man put in the senate or house of representatives who, turning out to be utterly unfit for the trust reposed in him, the Governor General could not remove.

The Philippine Assembly once expelled one of its members for improper conduct, and it is possible that for some good and sufficient reason the Governor General may have to exercise the power here given him. I hope not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not leave that authority to them?

Mr. JONES. The legislature can not do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can give them that power here.

Mr. JONES. It is easy to ask why we do not do this or that in the bill. The bill has been prepared with the utmost care, and the committee has come to the conclusion that this is the best way to solve this very difficult problem. And, as I said a few moments ago, it meets the approval of nearly everybody who has considered it. It meets the absolute approval of former Vice Gov. Gen. Gilbert, who was here a short time ago?

Mr. STAFFORD. Who is he?

Mr. JONES. He was the Vice Governor General of the Philippine Islands under the Taft administration, and he served in this House, I think, with the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now recall the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JONES. He is a very distinguished member of the gentleman's own party.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had said he was formerly a Representative from the State of Indiana, I would have immediately recalled him. I remember him very well.

Mr. JONES. Well, that distinguished gentleman, who was once a member of the commission, who as Vice Governor General acted as Governor General in the absence of Gov. Forbes, was shown this provision of the bill, and he thoroughly approves it. He has been in the Philippine Islands a great many years and consequently has much knowledge as to conditions there.

Mr. CLINE. Let me say right there that I would hate to have any reflection cast against Mr. Gilbert. He is my dooryard neighbor and has been for a number of years.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no intention of doing that.

Mr. CLINE. And I can vouch for his stand-pat Republicanism. It is as pure and undefiled as that of any Representative you have in this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose that is one reason why he is so much appreciated by the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] defeated him for reelection to this House, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. CLINE. He preceded me as a Member of this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recall his distinguished service as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there is one other thought I wanted to suggest to the House, in addition to the suggestion made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES], as to why this amendment should not be adopted. The proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], if adopted, would provide that the appointive senator should have a term of six years under the Towner amendment, and there would be no control over him from any source. Now, the gentleman understands that there is a somewhat delicate situation existing between the non-Christian tribes and the government of the Philippine Islands. It is entirely within the range of possibility that the Governor General might make a selection of a senator or a representative for the non-Christian territory which would be good at the time it was made, and which would be satisfactory to the non-Christian people at the time it was made, but which, because of shifting conditions, might become unsatisfactory to that same people; and if there did not exist a power of removing such a man it might lead to very delicate and embarrassing results in the Philippine Islands. I am sure gentlemen can appreciate that fact when they think carefully of what the situation is in the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 18. That the senate and house of representatives, respectively, shall be the sole judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their elective members, and each house may determine the rules of its proceedings. Both houses shall convene at the capital on the 16th day of October following the next election and organize by the election of a speaker or a presiding officer, a clerk, and a sergeant at arms for each house, and such other officers and assistants as may be required. The legislature shall hold annual sessions, commencing on the 16th day of October, or, if the 16th day of October be a legal holiday, then on the first day following which is not a legal holiday, in each year and continuing not exceeding 90 days thereafter (Sundays and holidays not

included). The legislature may be called in special session at any time by the Governor General for general legislation, or for action on such specific subjects as he may designate. No special session shall continue longer than 30 days, exclusive of Sundays. The legislature is hereby given the power and authority to change the date of the commencement of its annual sessions.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute a comma for the period following the word "proceedings," in line 20, section 18, page 13, and insert "punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member."

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment for the reason that I was unable to see why the legislature in the Philippines, both the house and the senate, should not have those powers that we give our own House and Senate under our own form of government. The right to determine the qualification of the members of that body ought to carry with it the right to depose the members. Mr. Chairman, if in the judgment of the assembly or of the senate the parties elected to represent certain districts were unworthy to sit as members of that body.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Would you think the legislature would not have that power unless it was specifically stated here?

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] that the legislature has that power now, I think. At any rate, it exercises it, and it has expelled one of the most popular Filipinos in the Philippines.

Mr. CLINE. It not only did that, I will say to the Chairman, but they expelled one of the members for conduct that was not becoming a member of the Philippine Assembly, and put another one on trial for the use of money in securing his election, and administered some form of punishment, the precise nature of which I do not distinctly recall now. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, we are writing an organic law for a new system of government in the Philippines.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I have no objection to the amendment. I do not think it is necessary, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You would have that amendment apply to the appointive members?

Mr. JONES. To the elective members.

Mr. GORDON. It does not say that.

Mr. CLINE. I make that apply here to the members of both houses.

Mr. JONES. To the elective members?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. It only applies to elective members?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; that was my purpose.

Mr. GORDON. I did not understand it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 21, after the words "on the," strike out "sixteenth" and "twelfth."

Mr. MOORE. Strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Those words are printed there—"strike out" and "insert" are printed on the blank.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Also on page 14, line 1, after the words "on the," strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Also at the end of the line strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] read a cablegram in which was incorporated a speech by Gov. Gen. Harrison. He suggested at the close of his remarks—I refer to the Philippine Commissioner—that he hoped some day the 12th of October would be celebrated in the Philippines as a national holiday.

Now, here is a bill to establish a new form of government for the Philippines which proposes to open the legislature on the 16th of October. It seems to me, in view of the gentleman's remarks and the appropriateness of the day, that it might be a happy suggestion if the committee would accept this amendment and have this opening legislative day fixed as of the 12th of October instead of the 16th. If the committee will consent

to move the event forward four days, then they will have the national holiday as the gentleman suggested.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if the time ever comes when that day is fixed as a national holiday, I think it would be entirely inappropriate to have it on the meeting day of the legislature. I think one event would interfere very much with the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. They should be allowed to recover from the effects of the holiday?

Mr. JONES. Yes. As the gentleman says, they would probably want to recover from the effects of the celebration before the legislature met.

But, seriously, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Virginia will remember that he is speaking in my time.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MOORE. I want to observe to the gentleman from Virginia that the 12th of October is, in many States of the Union, celebrated as a holiday now. It is an anniversary in American history. It is the day on which America was discovered by Christopher Columbus, and it would give an additional interest to the day in the Philippine Islands to have Congress open there then.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman that Columbus was looking for the Philippine Islands when he stumbled on America on the 12th of October, 1492. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Exactly. I do not know what day it was that the gentleman from Minnesota struck the Philippine Islands, but if you are going to establish these days as holidays it might be very appropriate to fix a "Miller Day" in the islands. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield, the only inappropriate feature about this suggestion is that Gov. Gen. Harrison did not land on the 12th of October, but on the 6th.

Mr. MOORE. Gov. Gen. Harrison was a distinguished Member of this House, whom we all respected very highly, and it would seem to me to be a graceful thing on the part of the Philippine Commission to give him a holiday. Gov. Harrison appealed to both sides of this House in his personal relations, and if the committee should deem it wise to move the opening of the legislature forward four days in his honor, we would have a Philippine national holiday and the opening of the legislature combined on the same day.

Mr. JONES. I do not suppose the gentleman is serious in his suggestion.

Mr. MOORE. I am serious. I think it is a very happy thought.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman can be serious. Even if the gentleman and the rest of us felt certain that the Filipinos were going to make that day a national holiday, I should not think it would be proper for the legislature to convene on that day. Mr. Chairman, this date was selected because it is the day upon which the legislature now meets. It was not the day upon which the legislature originally met, but it was subsequently, and after careful consideration, fixed upon.

Mr. MILLER. That was before the arrival of Gov. Gen. Harrison, was it not?

Mr. JONES. That was prior to his arrival; yes.

Mr. MILLER. They did not then have it in mind to celebrate the advent of Gov. Gen. Harrison.

Mr. JONES. The legislature has the right to change the date under this bill if it wishes to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential amendment to perfect the text before an amendment is offered as a new paragraph. Will the gentleman kindly withhold his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 14, the words "and continuing not exceeding 90 days thereafter, Sundays and holidays not included."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 14, by striking out all after the word "year," in line 3, down to the end of the sentence.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the clause that I move to strike out limits the term of the general session of the legislature to 90 days. Immediately following is a provision limiting to 30 days the special session to be convened at the call of the Governor General. Those special sessions have to be limited to such legislation, either general or special subjects, as he may designate in his proclamation. I think it is highly important to the welfare of the Filipinos, if we are going to give them a large measure of control as this bill purports to give them, to have unlimited time in which to pass on legislation when convened generally once each year. I do not think this Congress should hamstring them in any way, so as to force them to consider legislation within any limited period. I am aware that the constitutions of some States limit the duration of the term of the legislature, but from my knowledge of those conditions I do not believe that limitation is conducive to good legislation. Certainly it is not desirable for a people who are just launching out in legislative practice. If at the end of the 90-day period they are not able to conclude their work, they are then at the mercy of the Governor General, either to have the matters pending included in a special call or to have the legislation go over to the next regular convening of the legislature. If they have reached that stage of political development where they can be trusted with legislative powers, and we are willing to delegate that authority to them, then let us not limit them so that they can not pass intelligently upon the general legislation that this bill intends to vest in the legislature.

We know that the longer the time given to the consideration of legislative measures the better is the consideration. Here we create a new legislature, consisting of an elective house and an elective senate, meeting and organizing. It will take considerable time for those bodies to organize. It will take some time for them to have their committees appointed. It will take considerable time for the committees to give consideration to legislation. Even with the ordinary appropriation bills it takes a couple of months for our committees to report the bills back to the House; yet in this bill you intend to limit these persons, who are unskilled in the art of legislation. The end of the 90-day period will come all too soon. They will be driven to pass bills on the spur of the moment, and it will not be possible to give proper consideration to legislative matters. If the committee think there should be some limitation, so that these Filipinos shall not continue in session all the time, if perchance they have a penchant for sitting in a legislative assembly and legislating, then lengthen the limited period; but I seriously contend that 90 days is altogether too short a period for these novitiates in the art of legislation. Personally I believe there should be no limitation. If they are capable of legislating in self-government, they alone should determine when the term of their legislature should end, and you should not leave them, in case of a limited term, at the mercy of the Governor General to determine what character of legislation may be considered at a special session. They have not the powers of Congress in that respect. When the President calls us in extraordinary session, he may call us for a special purpose, but he can not limit us to that particular class of legislation. Our powers in that respect are unlimited and supreme, and the Philippine Legislature should have the supreme right and ample time to pass upon the legislation that we delegate to them in this organic act.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this provision of the bill is similar to the provisions upon the same subject in most of the States of the Union. We have a similar provision in the constitution of my State. However, I do not feel inclined to oppose this amendment. I am willing to leave almost everything to the Filipinos themselves, and I shall not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I now ask to have the amendment reported that I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"The senators and representatives shall receive a compensation for their services to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the Philippine Islands. The senators and representatives shall in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of the peace be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the sessions of their respective houses and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, I think there is not going to be any objection to the amendment offered, but I suggest whether or not it would not be well to provide that the compensation which the legislature has the power to fix shall be an annual compensation and not leave it so that the legislature could fix a per diem compensa-

tion. If the time is to be unlimited, I am rather inclined to think, in view of the amendment just adopted, that it would be good policy to require that it should be an annual instead of a per diem compensation.

Mr. CLINE. I think it is wise, in view of the amendment just adopted, and I ask leave, Mr. Chairman, to modify my amendment so as to make the compensation an annual one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he ask that this section be passed over for the present and then return to it for the gentleman to perfect his amendment.

Mr. CLINE. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass over this section and then return to it in order that the gentleman from Indiana may offer his amendment hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the section be passed over and that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to return to it later to offer his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question on this section. I would like to know whether the gentleman from Virginia would agree to limit the legislation in the special session to the call of the Governor General; whether he would be willing to strike out the last word on line 6, page 14, and all of line 17, and insert "to consider only such matters as he may designate"? In other words, whether you would be willing to limit the special session to such matters as the Governor General might designate?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the committee gave very careful consideration to this language before adopting it. There might be something very important to come up after the legislature had convened. If it could not consider it then, if it was of sufficient importance, another extra session would have to be called. After careful consideration we adopted the language in the bill.

Mr. FESS. I might say that in our constitutional convention two years ago we limited the legislation to the call of the governor of the special session, and we had a great deal of discussion on it. But the gentleman says that that question was considered fully.

Mr. JONES. Yes; we considered it very fully.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SLAYDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had excused Mr. SMITH of Arizona as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and had appointed Mr. THOMPSON in his stead.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That every bill and joint resolution which shall have passed both houses of the legislature shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor General. If he approve the same, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it with his objections to that house in which it shall have originated, which shall enter the objections at large on its journal and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of the members elected to that house shall agree to pass the same, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of all the members elected to that house it shall be sent to the Governor General, who shall transmit the same to the President of the United States. The vote of each house shall be by the yeas and nays, and the names of the members voting for and against shall be entered on the journal. If the President of the United States approve the same, he shall sign it and it shall become a law. If he shall not approve same, he shall return it to the Governor General so stating, and it shall not become a law: *Provided*, That if any bill or joint resolution shall not be returned by the Governor General as herein provided within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him the same shall become a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the legislature by adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law. The Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, but the veto shall not affect the item or items to which he does not object. The item or items objected to shall not take effect except in the manner heretofore provided in this section as to bills and joint resolutions returned to the legislature without his approval.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, line 8, page 15, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "thirty."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 15, line 8, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "thirty."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the provision is that unless the Governor General shall veto a bill within 10 days it will

become a law without his approval. I think the time is manifestly too short, and for this reason, which perhaps did not occur to the gentleman on the other side: I can conceive of a case where the Governor General seriously considers whether or not a veto shall be placed on a bill passed by the legislature, that it might, and almost certainly would, become his duty to communicate with the authorities at Washington regarding the matter before he takes such a responsibility. I think the time would be too short for this to be done, and, as I see it, no harm could come by extending it to 30 days.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. QUEZON. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to introduce further on an amendment providing that the absolute veto power be left in the Governor General's hands and not in the hands of the President of the United States?

Mr. TOWNER. I have such an amendment under consideration, but that need not affect consideration of the one I now offer.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I was not sure when the limit of 10 days was put in the bill that it would not be better to have it 15 days, but I have never thought that it would be right to have it as long as 30 days. If the gentleman would modify it to 20 days, I should be inclined to accept it.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not think 15 days is enough, but I will accept what I can get.

Mr. JONES. I would prefer 15, but rather than take up the time I will agree to 20.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask to modify my amendment by making it read "20" instead of "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks to modify his amendment by making it 20 days instead of 30. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 14, after the word "bill," insert the following: "or any independent provision not germane to the bill."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is this: The provision in the bill is that the Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, and then, so far as the extension of power is granted, it stops. I desire to add this further power to the Governor General which I think is accepted by most jurists now as a most important power, one that is being placed in new constitutions that are being adopted, that any independent provision which may be placed in a bill which is not germane to it, the thing that we call a "rider," should be subject to the veto of the Governor General. We all know how that works in Congress. We all know how many iniquities are perpetrated in Congress by such practice, and it is to avoid this that I offer the amendment. While it is given to the Governor General to veto an independent item of an appropriation bill, yet the legislature has the power to put any iniquitous, not germane, absolutely independent provision upon any appropriation bill and force the Governor General to sign the whole bill or allow the appropriation during the latter days of the session to fail.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman to another provision in the bill which I think he has overlooked, and that is that a bill must deal only with one subject matter, and that must be expressed in the title.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, that provision exists, as the gentleman well knows, in very many of the State constitutions, and in the passage by the legislature of these acts it is more honored in the breach than in the observance. Here is the difficulty with regard to that: For instance, an appropriation bill of that kind is passed, which would be subject to objection, which, if passed upon in the courts, might perhaps be held to be unconstitutional, and yet the importance of the passage of the law is so great that no one would dare raise the question and will suffer the iniquity to prevail rather than allow the bill to fail. Why should we not avoid these things, if we can, by the insertion of the provision which I suggest?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does not the gentleman's amendment limit itself to appropriation bills?

Mr. TOWNER. I hardly think so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand the question of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I raise the question whether the amendment of the gentleman does not limit itself to appropriation bills, when I think he wants it to apply to all bills as well as appropriation bills?

Mr. JONES. I did not think the gentleman wanted it to apply to any but appropriation bills.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HELM. The thought occurred to me that such an amendment as that would be very fertile of litigation, and also that if the court is going to sit in judgment and say what is and what is not germane, it seems like investing the court with legislative power or power in legislative proceedings.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why would not this cover it:

The Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items or provision in an appropriation bill.

I do not think that power ought to be given except upon an appropriation bill, because it is on an appropriation bill that that sort of thing is done. I would leave out the word "germane" entirely.

Mr. TOWNER. The language of the amendment is:

And any independent provision not germane to the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I would eliminate the feature of germaneness and make it any independent provision. There can not be any coercion practiced that is iniquitous except in an appropriation bill, and the legislature has the power not to appropriate for the supplies of the government unless certain things are agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question if the gentleman from Iowa will permit.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If you limit it to an appropriation bill, the veto power of this bill extends to anything not germane without further amendment, because you can veto any item in the bill without affecting the other part of the bill. If the item is not germane, he will veto it as it stands, but the gentleman from Iowa wants it to apply to all legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the technical point the gentleman from Iowa had in mind was that the language "item or items" would mean appropriations.

Mr. TOWNER. I think that is true.

Mr. COOPER. In an appropriation bill those are items of appropriation, and if you say "item or items in an appropriation bill or any other provision therein contained" that would cover it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say further, with regard to the matter, and especially with regard to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] said, that I think the language that is used in this amendment is better than that suggested by him for the reason that if it is an independent provision which is not germane to the bill, it is as clearly designated as it would be possible to designate it by language. Such language has a well-determined meaning. We have had decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States of what is germane and what is not germane. It is not a difficult proposition. Speakers and others acting as such in the House have been passing upon that for years, and it is a question that is peculiarly within the court's province.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not the desire of the gentleman from Iowa to give the Governor General of the Philippines the right to veto any provision in an appropriation bill?

Mr. TOWNER. It is.

Mr. COOPER. Whether it is germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. Well, under the provisions of the bill now—

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the gentleman wants the Governor General to have the power to veto any provision in an appropriation bill, whether it be germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman speaks about a "provision" —

Mr. COOPER. Well, any item.

Mr. TOWNER (continuing). While the language of the bill is "item." As the language of the bill now is, it says "shall have the power to veto any item or items of an appropriation bill," and that means particular appropriations for any particular purpose.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman said any item or provision in an appropriation bill that would cover it, but the gentleman wants him to have the power of veto whether it is germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. I am inclined to think possibly it might have that interpretation. I do not question that. I am only saying this to make clear what is the purpose and intent of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Towner], as highly as I respect his legal ability, that this is a desirable amendment. I think it really gives to the Governor General an arbitrary power that he ought not to have. The provision as to vetoing items in an appropriation bill is not an unknown provision in constitutions in different States in our country, and I think it is a wise provision, because it prevents the enforcement of an objectionable appropriation or item of law into a bill in order to secure the subsistence on which to run the government where there is a conflict between the governor and the legislature. But when you go beyond that, when you get away from appropriation bills and get to laws of other kinds, it seems to me that you have gone far enough when you provide by your constitution that which is in the constitution of many of the States of the Union, to the effect that the bill must only contain a single subject, and that subject must be clearly expressed in the title. That is a provision which is in the constitution of my own State, and it has led to considerable litigation, it is true, but it is better that we should go to the courts, in my opinion, than to leave it to the power of any Governor General arbitrarily to determine on the idea of germaneness. There would be absolutely no appeal from his decision. If he says, "I veto this provision in this bill because it is not germane," there is no appeal from his decision to any other tribunal except back to the legislature, where it will have to be passed by a two-thirds vote over his veto. I know of no such provision in any constitution of any State in this country. I am not familiar with the decisions of the United States Supreme Court to which the gentleman referred, discussing the question of germaneness, but the courts would never get any chance to pass on that proposition under this provision. It is left to the arbitrary power of the Governor General to exercise upon any idea that he might have on the question of germaneness. I do not think it is desirable or wise; on the contrary, I think it is dangerous.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I think, and have long thought, that the President of the United States ought to be given the power to veto any item in an appropriation bill that does not meet with his approval. In vetoing a measure he acts as a legislator. The exercise of the veto power is a legislative act. The President of the United States combines two functions—one, that of an executive, and the other that of a legislator. The act of vetoing a bill is the expression of his disapproval as a lawmaker. As a lawmaker he ought to have the right to be heard upon each item of an appropriation bill, and especially ought he to have the right to veto riders on appropriation bills. The Governor General in the Philippines ought to have a similar right. A rider may embody a proposition which the Philippine Assembly might desire to have become a law, but a proposition to which the Governor General and the Philippine Senate might be hostile. In such a case it would be possible for one house to say to the other house and to the executive, "We will refuse to help appropriate money to meet the necessary expenses of the government unless you will vote for this rider. You must take this rider, to which you are opposed, or we will starve the government." Legislation ought not to be the result of such coercion. It should be the free, untrammelled act of the legislature and the executive. The executive should have the right to say, "I am opposed to this provision in this appropriation bill. In my judgment it is a dangerous provision. Moreover, it is a provision that ought not to be in an appropriation bill at all. It is not an appropriation; it has no relation to any appropriation. I shall veto this particular item. If you wish it to become a law, you must again consider it and pass it by a two-thirds vote over my objection."

I have seen some very wrong things done in Congress through riders on appropriation bills and have more than once protested against them. We ought not to leave it possible for one house of the Philippine Legislature to say, "We will not pass the appropriations necessary to continue the Philippine Government

unless you will take such or such a law for Mindanao or Mindoro or Cebu." The payment of the legitimate expenses of the Philippine Government ought to be a subject separate and apart and to be considered by itself.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. It will not be at all wise to permit the Philippine Legislature to put riders on appropriation bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I quite agree with the gentleman as to appropriation bills.

Mr. COOPER. And I would not put them on anything else.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And we have that provision in the bill. Of course, the gentleman is aware of that fact. But I want to ask him if he does not think it is probably dangerous to go beyond appropriation bills and take ordinary matters of legislation and vest in the Governor General the absolute power of determining whether a thing is germane or not and vetoing it on that ground?

Mr. COOPER. My idea is to confine it to appropriation bills at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 12, after the word "shall," strike out "not be a law" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be made a matter of record in the office of secretary of state, who at the opening of the next session of the legislature shall report the same as the unfinished business after the organization of the legislature."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the Clerk report the amendment again? I did not quite catch it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the chairman of the committee say whether he would object to a proposition that when a bill is introduced and passed by the legislature and held by the Governor General without signing it, and before the 10 days are up the legislature adjourns, and thus the law fails, which would be called a "pocket veto," whether he would object to saving that feature by making this the unfinished legislation at the opening of the next session? It can be made a matter of record so as to become the unfinished business at the opening of the next legislature. That is the idea we have in Ohio. Legislation fails by the pocket veto when the legislature adjourns short of 10 days. On the other hand, if the legislature was in session the proposition would become a law if the governor would hold it. We prevent that veto by making that the unfinished business to be taken up by the next legislature. In Ohio it is retained in the secretary of state's office until the next session of the legislature and by him passed over to that body. That is to prevent a governor pocketing a piece of legislation and killing it by virtue of the legislature adjourning within the 10 days.

Mr. HELM. What is the procedure at the reconvening of the next legislature?

Mr. FESS. First, they organize the legislature, and this is laid before them as unfinished business.

Mr. HELM. De novo?

Mr. FESS. It comes up as a matter of record. It is taken up as the unfinished business and acted upon for or against.

Mr. HELM. And you pass it again?

Mr. FESS. Yes; reenact it. It saves the loss of it by the governor just pocketing it.

Mr. HELM. Is it subject to amendment?

Mr. FESS. Certainly. It could come up originally as new matter, but in this way it does not have to be reintroduced. It is made a part of the record in the office of the secretary of state. The wording of the Ohio constitution is, if a bill shall not be returned by the governor within 10 days, Sundays excepted, it shall become a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the general assembly by adjournment prevents its return, in which case it shall become a law, unless within 10 days after such adjournment it shall be filed by him with his objections in writing in the office of secretary of state.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman addressed a question to me, as to whether or not I would be willing to accept the amendment he proposes. He says there is a similar provision in the constitution of the State of Ohio; but, if so, I know of no other State that has such a provision. The gentleman is aware of the fact, I suppose, that there is no such position in the Philippines as secretary of state?

Mr. FESS. I should have said the office corresponding to that of secretary of state. That would be the secretary of the interior, would it not?

Mr. JONES. I can not say.

Mr. FESS. I would modify that to suit the situation.

Mr. JONES. I do not know what the position would be, but I do not think that the amendment ought to be adopted. It is an experiment, to say the least of it. As I have already said, I do not know of any State except the State of Ohio which has such a provision.

Mr. FESS. It makes the pocket veto impossible.

Mr. JONES. Any bill failing to become law because of the so-called pocket veto could be reintroduced at the next session. I see no reason why such a bill should be made the continuing order.

Mr. FESS. It should be the executive secretary, I suppose, instead of the secretary of state.

Mr. JONES. So I would not be willing, Mr. Chairman, to accept the amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion in the latter part of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia covered what I wanted to say, which was, in substance, this: That there is nothing to prevent the reintroduction of such a measure at the next session of the congress, or whatever it may be called, and its enactment. The only advantage I would see is that in effect it would become a special order and thereby hasten by a trifle its consideration.

Mr. FESS. The advantage is this, namely, that the governor would not likely put it in his pocket if he knew it was a continuing order and could be taken up at the next session. That is the main advantage. He would act upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 12, after the word "law," insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the President of the United States shall approve or disapprove an act submitted to him under the provisions of this section within six months from and after its passage and submission for his approval, and if not approved within such time it shall become a law, the same as if it had been specifically approved."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee indicate whether he is willing to accept this amendment or not?

Mr. JONES. I do not know of any special objection to it. I did not catch all of the language.

Mr. MILLER. It is the same as we adopted to the preceding paragraph, except that I notice the word "passage" is used there instead of "enactment."

Mr. JONES. I would be glad if the Clerk would report the amendment again and read it slowly, so that we can catch it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES. It reads "if not disapproved within such time?"

Mr. MILLER. It is the same as the language of the preceding amendment that we adopted.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to change the word "passage" in the amendment to the word "enactment," so that the language would be the same at this point as at other points in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to modify the language of his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, in justice to myself I wish to make a short statement to the committee. I am not at all satisfied with the provision of this bill regarding the appointment and the tenure of office of senators and representatives for the non-Christians. I have not, however, taken any part in the debate upon this subject, because, knowing, as I think I do, the reasons why the majority of the Committee on Insular Affairs thought it necessary to write those provisions, I was inclined to believe that it is more expedient to let them stand as they are.

It is evident, from the little I know of the sentiments of the membership of this House, that the idea of having the so-called senators and representatives appointed by the executive is as much abhorrent to them as it is to me, and so it is to make the tenure of office of those senators and representatives dependent upon the will of the executive. But, as I understand it, there was this practical question to meet by those responsible for the framing of the bill: They were aware that one of the most

debated features of the Philippine problem in this country is that of the administration and government of the non-Christian inhabitants of the archipelago. So much has been said about the unfriendly relations between the Christians and non-Christians in the islands, incompetency of the former to deal with the latter, and other absurdities of this kind, that, unless some kind of peculiar provision was decided upon whereby a partial concession to that contention is made, this bill would have been assailed as unwise legislation, and perhaps it would have been insisted that the non-Christians should be left entirely out of the control of the Philippine Legislature. Why, Mr. Chairman, there has just been introduced an amendment to this bill creating a special commission, to be appointed by the President of the United States, vested with the exclusive power to legislate for the non-Christians.

There is another reason why I have not opposed this proposition upon this floor. As I understand it, this is only a temporary arrangement which the Philippine Legislature, with the approval of the Governor General, may, by enactment, change.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. QUEZON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the gentleman's position that he does not approve the provisions of this bill intended to meet the situation? Does the gentleman believe that the provisions in this bill as they stand are not such as best to meet the situation with respect to the non-Christian tribes?

Mr. QUEZON. The gentleman is correct. I do not really approve of these provisions; but, as I said, I take them for reasons of expediency and because the Philippine Legislature herein provided and organized, with the approval of the Governor General, is empowered to amend that part of the law. I ask the gentleman from Virginia if I am not right?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. QUEZON. So that the legislature can meet this question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I just wanted to get the gentleman on record clearly; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MILLER. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, yeas 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, have we finished that section?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same. If at the termination of any fiscal year the appropriations necessary for the support of government for the ensuing fiscal year shall not have been made, the several sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for the objects and purposes therein specified, so far as the same may be done, shall be deemed to be reappropriated for the several objects and purposes specified in said last appropriation bill; and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer shall, when so directed by the Governor General, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first sentence of the paragraph, which reads as follows:

All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, lines 19, 20, and 21, strike out the following language: "All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, my main objection is to the reserve power of Congress at any time it sees fit, no matter how distant in the future after the enactment by the legislature, to annul some well-considered legislation that may even have been approved by the President of the United States.

In this bill we safeguard the interests of the Filipinos and the interests of the United States by reserving to the President the authority to veto all legislation relating to the tariff and revenue policy of the Philippine Islands, and also to their currency, and we further place a permissive veto power in the President's hands on all legislation that may be enacted by the legislature in reference to the forests, lands, and mining.

I assume that the committee, in singling out those subjects for special exception, considered that they were principal matters that should not become enacted into law without first being considered by the Philippine Legislature, by the Governor General, and then by the President of the United States.

To go to the further extreme and allow Congress at any time, without any limitation of time, to veto and annul all legislation, after perchance contract rights have become established, is, I think, going contrary to the spirit of this bill in seeking to vest in the Filipinos the right of self-government. I can not see wherein Congress should have that power, if we are safeguarding the interests of the Filipinos and also the interests of this Government wherein they are concerned, namely, in their tariff and currency system, or should go further than that. And, furthermore, I do not think that Congress is going to be concerned in passing upon that legislation after it passes the scrutiny of the President in the cases enumerated.

If it is the theory that the Congress should overlord the Government of the Philippines, well and good. We first appoint a Governor General whom we assume is capable. He is appointed by the President for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the Filipinos; and then, in addition to that, we reserve to the President the absolute right to say that no tariff legislation and no currency legislation shall become law until approved by the President; and then, further, we reserve the qualifying veto that, if the legislation refers to forests, lands, or mines, the President may, within six months after its presentation to him, veto the same.

Mr. QUEZON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am very glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. QUEZON. Of course, I sympathize with every proposition that tends to give more power to the Philippine Legislature; but I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that after striking out of the bill that section the Congress will still have the power and the authority to annul the laws of the Philippine Legislature? In my opinion, Congress would still have that power.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, Congress is sovereign, but we are establishing in the organic act what shall be the policy of this Government. This provision is absolutely inconsistent with the other provisions of this law. We say to the Filipinos, "We are giving you some sort of autonomous government, at least so far as certain legislation is concerned," and then we are putting in here a qualifying clause that would nullify all that legislation at some time in the distant future. It is utterly in conflict with the theory of this bill.

Mr. QUEZON. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I do not want him to think, nor do I want to be put in the RECORD as not favoring the idea of letting the Philippine Legislature be untrammelled. I just want to be sure whether the gentleman thinks that if that section is stricken out Congress will no longer have the power to annul our laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Congress has the right at any time to change this law or to change the whole form of government in the Philippine Islands; but in the organic act itself we should not lay it down as a fundamental principle that we are intending to scrutinize and pass judgment on all the legislation that may be enacted by the Philippine Legislature. If I understand the purpose of this bill, it is that the Philippine Legislature shall be vested with absolute power in certain particulars to work out their own destiny. If they fail in that endeavor, then we will have to provide a substitute government; but the very idea of the gentleman is that they are fit for greater power than this bill confers. Why should we nullify the power we give them by proclaiming the idea that all the legislation that they pass shall be subject to the negating power of Congress? It is not contemplated by any of us that we are going to pass upon their legislative acts.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be very earnest about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly am.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the gentleman if he was a Member of Congress 12 years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately I was not.

Mr. JONES. I was going to say that if the gentleman was here he voted for a similar provision at that time as to Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands also.

Mr. STAFFORD. I came into Congress just after its enactment. But the fact that we passed a provision 12 years ago is not to say that to-day we ought to pass the same enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Filipinos have advanced under American guidance, by the aid of the Americans who have been sent there to educate them and instruct them in the art of government, until they have laid the foundations on which the Filipinos can build. When we took up the occupation 12 years ago they were new to government, but I hope that they are sufficiently advanced now—at least that is the contention of the gentleman from Virginia—so that we should give them some freedom, so that they may pass this legislation without having it submitted afterwards to the negative vote of Congress.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has the gentleman time in two minutes to yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman think that Congress will have the power to make their enactments nugatory as long as the present relation between our Government and theirs continues to exist? Will not Congress continue to have that power if it chooses to exercise it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but we should not lay down here a principle that is inconsistent with the other provisions of this bill. The fundamental principle of this bill is that we are giving to the Filipinos absolute power to pass legislation on certain matters. Then we reserve to the President and the Governor General certain veto powers. No legislation affecting the tariff or the currency shall become effective until it has been approved by the President. Their legislation affecting mines, lands, and forests may be reviewed and may be vetoed by the President, but as to the other legislation this bill says their action shall be absolute. Now, why put in this qualifying clause and say that Congress shall have the authority to negative all that legislation when we do not intend to exercise that power?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is a mere statement of fact. We have that power.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in response to questions addressed to him by the Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON] and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], has admitted that, whether the language objected to by him is left in this bill or not, Congress will still have the right to annul any legislation passed by the Philippine Legislature. If that be so, it seems to me that the difference is just that between tweedledum and tweedledee. I can not understand how the gentleman can speak so earnestly upon a subject that he admits is of no practical moment. His position is that Congress undoubtedly has the power that is given in the bill, but that for some reason it should not declare that it possesses it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take it that it should not be the declared policy of Congress when you are claiming that the Filipinos are after absolute independence.

Mr. JONES. I understand the gentleman to say that Congress can annul any act of the Philippine Legislature, but should not say that it can do so. I do not think there is any force in the gentleman's objection to the use of this language in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. In a moment. I will say to the gentleman that this has been the policy of this Government with reference to the Philippines as well as to Porto Rico ever since those countries have been given civil government. Unfortunately, Congress never takes any notice of any act that is reported to it.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that I recently asked the House to give its consent to have printed certain acts of the Porto Rican Legislature, which, as is required by law, were certified to Congress. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected on the ground that Congress never paid any attention to these acts. I must admit that there was much truth in what the gentleman said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 20. That the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands shall, on the first Tuesday in June, 1915, and at the general elections thereafter provided for the election of senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature, elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who shall be entitled to an official recognition as such by all departments upon presentation to the President of a certificate of election by the Governor General of said Islands. Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum for stationery and for the pay of

necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and the franking privilege allowed by law to Members of Congress. No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said Islands owing allegiance to the United States and who is not more than 30 years of age and who does not read and write the English language. The two Resident Commissioners elected in June, 1915, shall hold their office from the first Monday in the month of December following until the 4th of March, 1919, and the term of their successors shall be for four years, beginning from the 4th of March following their election. In case of vacancy in the position of Resident Commissioner caused by resignation or otherwise, the Governor General may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Philippine Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancy; but the Resident Commissioner thus elected shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting patiently all day, having in mind what the gentleman from Massachusetts said was the purpose of the minority, and that was to prevent abuses. I have seen hardly a Member present from New England this afternoon, and in order that we may get some of them in I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is in error. There are a great many Members from New England here—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and a dozen others.

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, rather than get into a controversy over it I will withdraw the point. But there is not a single Member from Illinois and hardly a Member from the Middle States. [Laughter.] There is only one from New York, and only one from the whole Pacific coast.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There are three or four right around him from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I was talking about the minority.

Mr. BRYAN. I take exception to the gentleman's remark about the Pacific coast. There are several here.

Mr. PAYNE. There are several Members from New York present on this side.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there are three here from Wisconsin, others from New York and Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. And the majority is not represented by more than 15 Members.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; but think of the quality. [Laughter.] The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut withdraws his point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask now to have my amendment to section 18, which was passed over some time ago, again reported as modified.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, what became of the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdrew the point of order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the State of Pennsylvania for having one Member present in order to ask a question, you are so seldom seen here.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, are amendments now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] has an amendment pending.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment as modified be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"The senators and representatives shall receive an annual compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law and paid out of the treasury of the Philippine Islands. The senators and representatives shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think his amendment should come in as another paragraph?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify the amendment, so as to have it come in as an additional paragraph instead of an additional section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment, so that it will come in as an additional paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana wish to discuss it?

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because I believe it is based upon the soundest public policy. The two branches of the Philippine Legislature constitute a coordinate branch with the other governmental forces of the islands. But

the assembly and the senate, constituting the Philippine Legislature, coordinate with themselves. Consequently, all those rules and regulations in which each is vitally interested should be fixed in the organic act. It has been said that in formulating, as we are here, a law that shall be the basis of legislation in the Philippines, we can not expect to designate other than the important objects to be accomplished and that the minor ingredients that are involved in the important objects are proper subjects for legislation. This is undoubtedly true. When this amendment was proposed to our Constitution the matter was referred to what was known as a detail committee, of which Mr. Madison was a member. His understanding of the province of an organic act was not different than what I have stated. And yet he insisted that the language I propose now to insert into the Philippine act should be inserted in our Constitution. The question as to the extent that legislative bodies should go in writing a constitution has frequently been raised in considering this bill. In connection with that proposition I desire to quote the language of Chief Justice Marshall, used in the McCulloch case, Fourth Wheaton, page 407:

A constitution to contain an accurate detail of all the subdivisions of which its great powers will admit, and of all the means by which they may be carried into execution, would partake of the prolixity of a legal code, and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. It would probably never be understood by the public. Its nature, therefore, requires that only its great outline should be marked, its important objects designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature of the objects themselves.

Undoubtedly with that understanding of their duties in mind the framers of the Constitution still wrote the amendment that I present into the Constitution of the United States. Let me call the committee's attention to the fact that there is the strongest reciprocal relation expressed between the members of the Philippine Legislature and the people they represent. It is undoubtedly true that for the proper conduct of public business members of the Philippine Congress should be "privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and going to and from the same," and that each legislator should be free and without restraint to express his well-grounded opinion and conviction upon any subject before that body, and he should not be held to an account for his opinion or for his speech in any other place. The people likewise have rights to be protected. It should be embodied in the organic law that for treason, felony, or breach of the peace no legislator should be permitted to shelter himself under the legislative cover of his own enactment. As I said before, these rights are so reciprocal, so based upon sound public policy, that in the United States they have been engrafted in almost identical terms in nearly every State constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, after the word "salary," strike out the words "and expenses," and on the same page, line 17, after the words "sum for," insert the words "mileage and."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am as much inclined to be liberal with the members of congress of the Philippine Islands as any Member on the floor, but I question whether we ought to be more liberal with them than with ourselves. What the term "and expenses," in line 16, means I do not know. I do not know whether it is intended to include mileage or not. It is not so stated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It says "expenses now allowed by law." The law allows them \$2,000 for expenses in lieu of regular mileage that we receive.

Mr. MOORE. Does that include mileage?

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is the mileage.

Mr. COOPER. That is the mileage.

Mr. MOORE. They are allowed \$2,000 for mileage?

Mr. COOPER. It is in lieu of mileage, and they also have a secretary.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the section proposes to give to each of the members in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law the same sum for stationery and pay of necessary clerk hire as is now paid Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. That does not appear to include mileage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Instead of allowing the Philippine Commissioners the mileage based upon distance, the Congress has allowed them a limited sum for mileage of \$2,000, and this provision carries that into the law.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the gentleman's understanding that \$2,000 covers their entire pay and also their mileage and expenses?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; it covers merely their mileage allowance for traveling from the Philippines here and back.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, this is for the Philippine Commissioners to the United States?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; the two Resident Commissioners who represent the Philippines in the Congress.

Mr. SLAYDEN. In addition to their salary as Commissioners, and in addition to the \$2,000 which is given them in lieu of mileage on the distance basis, they are allowed by this provision clerk hire and stationery.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment under a misapprehension, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee to interpret the phrase "bona fide elector of said islands, owing allegiance to the United States, and who is not more than 30 years of age," which occurs in lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 16. What is the legal evidence of that status—"owing allegiance to the United States"?

Mr. MILLER. In other words, does it refer to the islands or to the Commissioners?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. And if it refers to the Commissioners, just what condition of allegiance?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any difficulty about that. There has been some question heretofore as to the use of the words "bona fide." I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] or some gentleman on that side suggested the word "actual" in lieu of the words bona fide.

Mr. MILLER. That was simply because the word "actual" had previously been used in the bill.

Mr. JONES. I said at that time that I did not understand that there was any difference between the word "actual" and the words "bona fide" as they were used. Of course, owing allegiance to the United States applies to the Resident Commissioners and not to the islands. The language is plain, and I will read it:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands owing allegiance to the United States and who is not more than 30 years of age.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can readily see that any construction of that language suggests that "owing" refers to the islands fully as much as to the Commissioners, and possibly more.

Mr. JONES. If that were true it would make no difference, but it can not be true.

Mr. QUEZON. That is copied from the old law.

Mr. MILLER. Even though the old law made a mistake, we do not want to repeat it here.

Mr. JONES. As has been suggested, this language is an exact copy of the law passed by Congress 12 years ago and for which the gentleman's party is responsible.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. JONES. Therefore, I may refer the gentleman's question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], who was chairman of the committee at that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin has just left the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER. "No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner," assuming that the construction of the chairman of the committee is correct, "who is not a bona fide elector of said island and who does not owe allegiance to the United States." Now, that would make it clearer, as far as the language is concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The question the gentleman suggests is a differentiation in his mind between "islands" and "persons."

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Clearly that differentiation is proper. The word "islands," as used in this relation, undoubt-

edly means the physical land which is there. That being the case, you could not have land owing allegiance. The land could not owe allegiance to the United States. It is nothing but the individual who could owe allegiance.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can offer a very excellent argument on that hypothesis, but the language is "islands owing allegiance to the United States," and I can readily conceive how that phraseology may mean territory from which the man comes is part of territory owing allegiance to the people of the United States.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that I have the organic law in my hand. It provides:

That no person shall be eligible at such election who is not a qualified elector of said islands owing allegiance to the United States, and who is not 30 years of age.

That has been the law for the past 12 years, and there has never been any confusion or question about it, and it seems to me—

Mr. MILLER. It is not that which bothers me. I am willing to accede to the gentleman's construction that the word "owing" refers to the commissioner and not to the islands; but let us see where that leaves us. Now, just exactly what qualification must a Resident Commissioner enjoy that will enable him to comply with these requirements; that is, what must he do to owe allegiance to the United States?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. He does not have to do anything. If he is a resident and citizen of the islands, he does owe allegiance to the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Is the gentleman quite sure about that?

Mr. QUEZON. Unless he is in actual rebellion.

Mr. MILLER. Does he owe allegiance to the Philippine Government?

Mr. JONES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman owe allegiance to the United States Government?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly do.

Mr. JONES. What does the gentleman have to do to show that?

Mr. MILLER. I have taken the oath of office, for one thing, in which I state that I do.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from the Philippines also has to take an oath of office.

Mr. MILLER. That is after he has been elected, but this says "no person shall be eligible."

Mr. JONES. There is no difference between the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from the Philippines in that respect.

Mr. MILLER. But this says that no person shall be eligible to the office. I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. In line 23 the differentiation there is "who is not a bona fide elector." In line 24, "who is not more than 30 years of age." Line 25, "who does not read and write." You have the expression very clearly in the three lines. Now, instead of saying "allegiance," why not insert "and who does acknowledge allegiance to the United States"?

Mr. MILLER. I think that would be a decided improvement.

Mr. FESS. You have a rhetorical sentence, and one that can not have any ambiguity in it.

Mr. MILLER. I think that would be a decided improvement, but I think there may be some technical difficulty in this language requiring the Resident Commissioner to owe allegiance to two sovereignties. We will assume the sovereignty of the United States extends over the islands, and to that extent he can owe allegiance to the United States and be a Filipino.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio for a moment and ask him to read again, so that the gentleman from Virginia may hear it, the change in the language that he suggests, and which I believe does make a much simpler and clearer sentence.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand that there is anything before the committee.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There was an amendment offered, I understood.

Mr. FESS. The language I suggested would be "and who does not acknowledge," so it would read:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands and who does not acknowledge allegiance to the United States, and who is not more than 30 years of age, and who does not read and write—

And so on.

Mr. JONES. Let me see in just what line it is.

Mr. FESS. It comes after the word "islands," in line 23. Strike out the word "owing," in line 23, and insert "who does not acknowledge."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to adjourn. There does not seem to be any business going on here.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We are trying to agree on the phrasing of an amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to offer an amendment, so that there would be something pending.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] offered an amendment. I yield the floor now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] offered an amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I meant to offer an amendment that, after the word "islands," on page 16, line 23, strike out the word "owing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and who does not acknowledge."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 23, after the word "islands," strike out the word "owing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and who does not acknowledge."

So that the amended lines will read:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands and who does not acknowledge allegiance to the United States.

Mr. JONES. What was the language as last modified, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would be willing to put it in this language, "who does not owe allegiance."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I accept it. The word "acknowledge" does not necessitate going to court.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee kindly take us into his confidence and inform us when he intends to move that the committee rise?

Mr. JONES. We have gone so slowly on this bill that I would like to get along a little further before I make the motion.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are several amendments to this section, and as 5 o'clock is the usual rising hour—

Mr. JONES. Let us offer the amendments to this section, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to modify his amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out in line 6, on page 17, the word "four" and insert the word "six" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 6, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. TOWNER. I will not take any time, Mr. Chairman, in discussing it. The gentleman understands the necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a serious question that is involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, as to whether we should lengthen the term of the Resident Commissioners, which is now two years, to six years.

Mr. JONES. It is now four years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Four years as provided in this bill and under existing law?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under a misapprehension. Even then it is quite questionable whether the same persons, without any right of recall, should be serving in this Chamber for the lengthy period of a six-year term. I know the difficulty that is confronting the chairman and the members of the committee. You have provided for triennial elections, and therefore you would have a hiatus if you provided merely for four years.

Mr. JONES. I was about to ask the gentleman if he was present when we had the discussion over it a day or two ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been present at all times during the consideration of this important bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was willing and the Commissioner from the Philippines was perfectly willing to reduce it to three years, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] pointed out that that would not correspond with our terms here, and you have either got to reduce it to two years—

Mr. STAFFORD. You can not make it two.

Mr. JONES. You have either got to put it at six years or make some other change. To leave the term at four years will necessitate the holding of an additional election throughout the islands.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seemed to me that the period was very long for the Philippines to be represented in this body at one time by the same persons without opportunity for a change.

Mr. JONES. I agree with the gentleman about that, but there does not seem to be any other practical way of settling it.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the question was last under consideration the gentleman from Virginia recognized the difficulty that was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I did not know that he had since considered it. But if he has since considered it and thinks it is impossible of correction, of course we are confronted with a condition that has to be met.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make this suggestion to the gentleman, that there is nothing in this law regarding the election of Resident Commissioners which provides that they should have seats in this body, nor was there anything in the original law; and so far as I know it was not necessarily in contemplation, at the time the Resident Commissioners were provided for in this organic act, that they should have seats in the Congress. The great bulk of the duties of Resident Commissioners lies elsewhere than in this body, and there is no provision in the rules of the House now that gives the Resident Commissioners seats on the floor of the House. The custom is at the beginning of each Congress to introduce a resolution to the effect that during that Congress they should be admitted to seats in the House and be permitted to participate in the debates. So there will be no danger, I think, about the question of the length of their terms. The great bulk of their duties is not here at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. On second thought, Mr. Chairman, Congress is surrendering, so far as legislation is concerned, its right over many matters and transferring it to the Philippine Legislature as provided for in this bill, and therefore I see that we have a practical condition to meet, and I shall not oppose the amendment.

But in that connection I would like to inquire if the gentleman does not want to follow that up with another amendment, to change the dates here as to when the terms of these Commissioners shall begin and expire? I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are some dates predicated upon a four-year term of office, and ask if that will not have to be changed if we lengthen the time to six years?

Mr. JONES. I do not know of any dates that would have to be changed. The term of office would begin on the 4th day of March following their election. They would be elected in June.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me read to the gentleman:

The Resident Commissioners elected in June, 1915, shall hold their office from the first Monday in the month of December following until the 4th of March, 1919.

That would be for a four-year term. There would be no election at that time, and the term of their successors is to be six years, beginning with the 4th of March following their election. If you follow that up, you will find that there will be no election held in the year following March 4, 1919. That will have to be corrected. I do not know whether you have given consideration to that or not.

Mr. JONES. That would be "1921," I suppose. The other amendment has not been adopted yet, has it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is pending, offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment: Page 17, line 5, strike out "nineteen" and substitute for it the word "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, strike out the word "nineteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to present some resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. In just a moment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of resolutions passed by the Ocala Board of Trade with reference to river and harbor matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Ocala, Fla., as to river and harbor improvements.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, we did not hear the gentleman here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Ocala with reference to rivers and harbors. They are very short.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That, except as provided otherwise in this act, the executive departments of the Philippine Government shall continue as now authorized by law until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature. When the Philippine Legislature herein provided shall convene and organize, the Philippine Commission, as such, shall cease and determine and the members thereof, except the Governor General and heads of executive departments, shall vacate their offices as members of said commission. The Philippine Legislature may thereafter by appropriate legislation increase the number or abolish any of the executive departments, or make such changes in the names and duties thereof as it may see fit, and shall provide for the appointment and removal of the heads of the executive departments by the Governor General, and may provide that heads of executive departments shall have seats in either or both houses of the legislature, with the right of debating or voting or both: *Provided*, That all executive functions of the Government must be directly under the Governor General or within one of the executive departments under the supervision and control of the Governor General. There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the bureau of non-Christian tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to submit to this paragraph, but I think it would be better to submit it to-morrow; and I am willing that the gentleman from Virginia should move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOB of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FOSTER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE, for three weeks, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. WATSON, for two days, on account of sickness in family.

CHANGE OF CONFEREES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 8 (calendar day October 12), 1914.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona was excused as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and Mr. THOMPSON was appointed in his stead.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER,
Secretary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13296. An act for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York; and
H. R. 12161. An act to remove the charge of desertion against John Mitchell.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting part 2 of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Lighthouses for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, containing, in pursuance of provisions of section 8 of the act of June 17, 1910, a list of purchases made by private contract or in open market, with the reasons for such purchase, during the fiscal year 1914, of materials and supplies for the use of the Lighthouse Service (H. Doc. No. 1174), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DRISCOLL, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1185), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19245) for the temporary relief of cotton and tobacco growers of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT (by request): A bill (H. R. 19246) to amend section 70 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POUL: A bill (H. R. 19247) to provide emergency issue of bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19248) to provide for the issue and sale of the Panama Canal bonds and for the deposit of their proceeds in certain banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 19249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls to the town of Homestead, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 19250) relating to desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAUGHAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of Vicksburg Harbor at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HENRY: Resolution (H. Res. 643) for the consideration of S. 6505, S. 6266, H. R. 19203, S. 6398, and H. R. 15038; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 19251) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 19252) for the relief of James Nolen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 19253) granting a pension to George S. Salts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19254) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 19255) granting a pension to Hannah Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19256) granting an increase of pension to John H. Condon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 19257) granting an increase of pension to David L. Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19258) granting an increase of pension to George O. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 19259) for the relief of Bridget Mooney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 19260) granting a pension to Florence D. Hanna; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19261) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: Petitions of Dr. William Rice, of Rome, Pa., and the Hostetter Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of T. A. Werble, of Panco; F. J. Strittmatter and wife, of Edensburg; Will F. Gordon and William Sibert, of Hastings; and Goeuner & Co., Fronheiser & Schuster, Elizabeth and Catherine Goeuner, W. W. Campbell, of Johnstown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against war tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Turner Drug Co., of Altoona, Pa., F. W. Jordan, jr., and John R. Doll, of Bedford, Pa., protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of various residents of the twenty-second district of Illinois, relative to taxation of mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Germain Lumber Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., against enactment of legislation preventing the purchase of stamped envelopes with business cards printed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House bill 4809, fixing the standard barrel of fruit; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., relative to tax on land values; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of the Stelling Furniture Co., of Railroad; Wentz Bros. & Frey, of Hammer; C. A. Blochee, of Gettysburg; Haflugh & Co., of Philadelphia; and the Farmers' Bank, of McSherrytown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against bill prohibiting sale of return envelopes by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of 40 citizens of Winfield, 1,075 citizens of Pittsburgh, 195 citizens of Cherokee, 202 citizens of Moline, 670 citizens of Parsons, 63 citizens of Thayer, and 1,075 citizens of Cherryvale, all in the State of Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Local United Lodge, No. 66, International Association of Machinists, protesting against House bill 17890, relative to stop watch in Government departments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. P. Bacon & Co. and the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, protesting against tax on grain sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. R. Eberle, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of Hon. James W. Stevens, mayor of Albany, N. Y., and the Chamber of Commerce of Cohoes, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the proposed Government armor-plate plant at Breakers Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of H. Planter & Sons and S. V. B. Swann, of Brooklyn, and the Morgan Drug Co., of Brooklyn and New York City, protesting against war tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Millers' Association, of New York City, and the Thompson Milling Co., of Lockport, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Moss grain bill (H. R. 17329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. Glasroff, Alex Gardner, Otto Reubedeetow, the Kings County Pharmaceutical Association, and Charles Killian, of Scales Mound, N. Y., and H. Plantin & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERSHEM: Petition of 61 citizens of Mifflin, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Peter Breidt City Brewery Co., of Elizabeth, N. J., protesting against war tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jac. B. Zimmermann, of Guttenberg, N. J., protesting against war tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring national department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of the Gregory Hood Live Stock Co., of Lancaster, S. C., against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Drug Co., R. F. Kee, J. F. Mackey & Co., C. L. McManus, the Lancaster Pharmacy, W. F. Laney, the Lancaster Drug Co., I. E. Foster, the People's Drug Co., and E. C. Mackey, all of Lancaster, S. C., against tax on drug business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, of New York, favoring creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Syracuse, Nebr., favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of Arthur T. Vance, editor of the Pictorial Review, of New York, N. Y., against House bill 10238, to amend the copyright law; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Yosemite Tribe, No. 103, Independent Order of Red Men; Rienhold Richter Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans; Alpha Neighborhood Club; Independent Order of Odd Fellows' Military Band; and the Monadnock Tribe, No. 100, Independent Order of Red Men, all of San Francisco, Cal., representing a total membership of 1,146, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, to pension superannuated Federal civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Petition of the Wrigley Chewing Gum Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Hostetter Co., of Pittsburgh; W. L. Bucher, of Columbus; and E. Z. Gross and George A. Gorcas, of Harrisburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Petitions of George W. Whitlow and others, C. B. Dixon and others, and M. J. Compton and others, all of the State of Virginia, relative to personal rural credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petitions of 500 citizens of Bentons Camp, Va., and 70 citizens of Houston, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petitions of 68 members of the First Baptist Church of Colchester, Ill., and 80 members of Cedar Creek (Ill.) Baptist Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Chatham, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of various farmers of Big Reedy, Ky., favoring financial relief for farmers in present emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, October 13, 1914.

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to present to the Senate this morning a few telegrams and two or three letters. I can, of course, read them myself, but I would prefer to send them to the desk and let the Secretary read them. The first is a telegram from the president of the State Bankers' Association of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AMERICUS, GA., October 12, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If possible, hold Congress in session until some action is taken to provide some relief for the people of the cotton-growing States. The cotton market is now flat and approaching the 5-cent-per-pound level in the interior, with the demand very limited. Imperative something be done. It appears that the governors and legislators of the cotton States can not agree or unite on any plan for relief. The interest of the entire country involved in the threatened disaster to the South. You fully realize the gravity of the situation, and I feel sure will exercise your every effort to obtain relief.

L. G. COUNCIL,
President Georgia Bankers' Association.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The next telegram I send to the desk is from the editor of the Ruralist, an agricultural paper with a circulation of something like 250,000 subscribers. He is a man of conservatism, and a scholar.

The Secretary read as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., October 12, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Just returned from extended trip over cotton section. Conditions are infinitely worse than press finds expedient to publish. We all fear that unless relief comes through national or United States action horrible conditions will soon develop. Am leaving to-night for Fort Worth, Tex., to attend farmers' national congress in hope of lining up concerted effort.

H. E. STOCKBRIDGE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The next telegram is from a well-informed resident of a rural section.

The Secretary read as follows:

CALHOUN, GA., October 12, 1914.

Senator HOKE SMITH, Washington, D. C.:

Banks having to push collection. Farmers being compelled to sacrifice their cotton around 6 cents. This spells ruin to many and honest, hard-working families. Many women and children in the South will suffer the coming winter for lack of food and clothing, although no fault of theirs, a guarantee reduction of next year's crop will put price where people can live. Act before it is too late. Quick action is what the South desires and wants. Please hand to President Wilson.

Your friend,

P. M. BOAZ.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD two short letters from farmers. They present the case as it affects the farmer and the tenant farmer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letters referred to are as follows:

LUTHERSVILLE, GA., October 9, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH.

DEAR FRIEND: Several of my friends have asked me to write you in regard to cotton. Now, you see our condition: We have gone ahead and bought everything this year at a high price; you know, everything was based on 13-cent cotton; now the guano men want us to sell our cotton and pay the money for our guano. Now, cotton is selling for 6½ cents for grade 4 to-day. Now, my guano account this year is \$252.90, so, at 6½ cents for cotton, it will take about eight bales to pay this account. Now, if cotton was selling for 13 cents, like it was when I bought the guano, it would only take about four bales at 13 cents. So it is with everything the farmer bought this year; so when you begin to think about the farmer, he is in bad luck. Now, you see, we farmers depend on our cotton for our money. Now, you see, they are just giving us half price for our cotton; so, you know, if our cotton don't pay our debts, they will take everything the farmer has. You know, they can take the last grain of corn, fodder, and everything that way; the last cow and hog. You know the law gives them that authority. I know the law gives the farmer a chance to bankrupt and homestead; but it is this way with the farmer: Now, if the farmer has got to go to the devil to save his stuff, the farmer had rather see the other fellow take the stuff. I hope it will be so you good men can protect us farmers at once, for we need help at once. The farmers have lost hope, so they are turning their cotton over at these ungodly prices.

Your friend,

LUTHER KEITH.

LYERLY, GA., October 10, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: I received your speech. I tell you, unless something is done to help out the cotton farmer, and that soon, it need not be done at all, for if this cotton crop has to be sacrificed at present prices, the poor tenant farmer is ruined and can not go on to make another crop,